DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 236 820 EC 160 838

AUTHOR Clarke, S. C. T.; Nyberg, V. R.
TITLE Evaluation of the Alberta School for the Deaf.
INSTITUTION Alberta Dept. of Education, Edmonton. Planning Services Branch.
PUB DATE May 83
NOTE 272p.; Parts of the document have light print.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC11 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Deafness; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Formative Evaluation; Parent Attitudes; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Surveys; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Alberta School for the Deaf

ABSTRACT

The report summarized a formative evaluation of the Alberta (Canada) School for the Deaf (ASD). Data were collected via observations by 12 consultants; interviews; and questionnaires completed by parents, teachers, students, and administrators. The evaluation was designed to focus on such aspects as instruction (including curriculum) and total communication staff roles and functions, school climate, parental involvement, program impact on recent graduates and current students, and administration issues. Among findings reported are differences of opinion concerning the use of American Sign Language, yet uniformity of agreement on other issues such as the use of total communication, the need for parent education, and the existence of adequate funding. Specific findings and recommendations are offered for the following topics: the need for coordination and communication, integration, standards of school achievement. parent education, administration residence provisions, specific instructional programs (including language arts, social studies, science, and mathematics) and assessment and monitoring. Reports of three evaluators are appended. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED236820

EVALUATION OF THE ALBERTA SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- [x] This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- [ ] Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Planning Services

EC 160838

Alberta
EDUCATION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
W P Eddy
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EVALUATION OF THE ALBERTA SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF

S. C. T. CLARKE and V. R. NYBERG

under contract to Alberta Education

Edmonton, Alberta

May, 1983

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The valuable contributions of the three out-of-province specialists, Mr. John Anderson, Principal, Saskatoon School for the Deaf, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Mrs. Bernice Ryan, Principal, Teacher Education Centre, Sir James Whitney School, Bellevile, Ontario, and Mr. Marshall Wick, Professor, Gallaudet College, Washington, D. C. are acknowledged with respect. Many others assisted, directly or indirectly with the evaluation. A complete listing would be virtually impossible to compile, therefore, the groups involved, only, are mentioned here.

Alberta Education's contribution came from senior officials and from the many consultants and specialists who reviewed documents and met with teachers. The staff of the Alberta School for the Deaf assisted in many ways. The administration gave much direct information, coordinated the numerous visits, and provided meeting space and secretarial assistance. The teachers, houseparents, and child care attendants also contributed much needed information. Parents and students gave assistance, as did many former students who were in post-secondary institutions. Several colleagues from the Department of Educational Psychology, University of Alberta, provided valuable assistance and advice. The help of the steering committee, of the Parents' Community Council, and of the very capable interpreters is gratefully acknowledged. Finally, some very special groups must be mentioned: The typists that managed to rush the work as required; and the principal evaluators' family members who were frequently called upon. Their contributions are also gratefully acknowledged.

S. C. T. Clarke
V. R. Nyberg
May, 1983

EVALUATION OF THE ALBERTA SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF

ABSTRACT

An evaluation of the Alberta School for the Deaf (ASD), an institution operated by the Alberta government, was authorized in the summer of 1982. The main areas to be investigated, as specified in the terms of reference, were: instruction, including support services, curriculum, evaluation of achievement, total communication, and articulation among grades; staff including role perceptions, inservice activities, attitudes, and general effectiveness; school climate, including sense of community, relationships among staff, parents, and students; parents' involvement, including roles in fostering student development, and services available to parents, impact on recent graduates; impact on current students; and administration, including policy development, supervision, and program coordination.

Investigation procedures consisted of specially constructed questionnaires, interviews, observation and reports by twelve Alberta Education subject area consultants, who were experienced in school evaluations, observation and reports by experts in deafness and education of the deaf, and review of documents relating to the operation of ASD, its effectiveness, and possible future development.

Several major findings were reported. First of all, there was diversity of opinion, both between groups and among groups, in several areas, the most notable being the use of ASL. A second finding was the identification of areas of agreement. These areas included a favorable opinion toward total communication, need for parent education, and the view that financial support for the school is generous. Third, it was found that ASD is a good school, but in need of some improvement. A fourth finding was that the residences provide an essential service, and the off-campus group homes provide valuable experiences in living. Fifth, it was noted that administration needs

strengthening. Next, it was found that a matter of real concern is the difficulty in integrating deaf students into the hearing world. With respect to instruction, it was found that there is lack of agreement in what the instructional program should be, and there is a need to improve the achievement standards, especially in the language arts, although no benchmarks of achievement applicable to deaf students could be found.

Several recommendations, based on the findings were put forward. A system of continuous evaluation was suggested, first of all, and next an improved system of communication and co-ordination among staff and departments. A third recommendation dealt with integration with the hearing world. Next it was proposed that achievement norms for deaf students be developed over a period of years, and then a recommendation was made that the upper age limit of students be changed from 18 to 21 years. Recommendations were also made regarding parent education, changes in administration, and residence living, and in instructional procedures.

Finally, several possibilities with respect to future developments were explored. The purpose was not to recommend a particular structure but to give a brief view of a few interesting possibilities.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I - BACKGROUND

1. ORIGIN AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

		Page
1.1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.2	ORIGIN AND PURPOSES	1
1.3	STEERING COMMITTEE	2
1.4	OUTCOMES and PROCESSES: DESCRIPTIONS and JUDGMENTS	2
1.5	DELIMITATIONS	5

2. DEAFNESS

2.1	INTRODUCTION	7
2.2	DEFINITIONS	7
2.3	CAUSES	8
2.4	INCIDENCE	10
2.5	COMMUNICATION	11
2.6	DEAFNESS IS LIKE A LEAD BOOT	12
2.7	DEAF CULTURE	12

3. PARENTS OF DEAF CHILDREN

3.1	FIRST REACTIONS	16
3.2	SECOND REACTIONS	16
3.3	PARENTAL EXPECTATIONS	17
3.4	NEED FOR PARENT EDUCATION	18
3.5	THE PARENTS' COMMUNITY COUNCIL	19

4. THE ALBERTA SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF

4.1	HISTORY	25
4.2	PREVIOUS STUDIES	25
4.3	BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS	27
4.4	ADMINISTRATION	28
4.5	STUDENTS	29
4.6	TEACHERS	32
4.7	RESIDENCES AND RESIDENCE STAFF	34
4.8	OTHER STAFF	35
4.9	FINANCES	36
4.10	LOOKING AHEAD - THE NEXT 25 YEARS	37

PART II. PROCEDURES

		Page
5.1	OVERVIEW OF PROCEDURES	39
5.2	ALBERTA EDUCATION CONSULTANTS	40
5.3	EXTERNAL SPECIALISTS	41
5.4	INTERVIEWS	42
5.5	QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARENTS	43
5.6	QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS	44
5.7	QUESTIONNAIRE FOR HOUSEPARENTS AND CHILD CARE ATTENDANTS	45
5.8	QUESTIONNAIRE FOR GRADUATES	46
5.9	QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SENIOR STUDENTS	47
5.10	DOCUMENTS AND RECORDS	49

PART III. RESULTS

6.1	RESULTS FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARENTS . .	50
6.2	RESULTS FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS . .	60
6.3	RESULTS FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR HOUSEPARENTS AND CHILD CARE ATTENDANTS	70
6.4	RESULTS FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR GRADUATES . .	75
6.5	RESULTS FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SENIOR STUDENTS	90
6.6	SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT ON ASD	92

PART IV. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7. MAJOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

		Page
7.1	INTRODUCTION	95
7.2	MAJOR FINDINGS	97
7.3	OVERALL EVALUATION	99
	Recommendation 1 Continued Evaluation	102
7.4	THE NEED FOR COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION	102
	Recommendation 2 Communication and Coordination	106
7.5	INTEGRATION	107
	Recommendation 3 Integration	114
7.6	STANDARDS OF SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT	114
	Recommendation 4 Standards of School Achievement	119
7.7	PARENT EDUCATION	119
	Recommendation 5 Parent Education	121
7.8	ADMINISTRATION	121
	Recommendation 6 Administration	130
7.9	RESIDENCE PROVISIONS	131
	Recommendation 7 Residence Provisions	133

8. INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

8.1	INTRODUCTION	134
8.2	LANGUAGE ARTS	134
	Recommendation 8 Language Arts	159
8.3	SOCIAL STUDIES	161
8.4	SCIENCE	163
8.5	MATHEMATICS	166
8.6	HOUSEHOLD ECONOMICS	167
8.7	INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION	169
8.8	PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND HEALTH	171
8.9	ART	174
8.10	TYPEWRITING	175
8.11	OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES	176
	Library	176
	Guidance	178

PART IV. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (continued)

		Page
8.12	ASSESSMENT AND MONITORING	180
	Recommendation 9 Assessment and Monitoring	181
8.13	GENERAL	181
	Recommendation 10 Associate Membership ATA	182
	Recommendation 11 Inservice Education	182
	Recommendation 12 American Sign Language	183

9. LOOKING AHEAD

9.1	INTRODUCTION	184
9.2	NEEDS	185
9.3	ALTERNATIVE FUTURES	197
9.4	CONCLUSION	205

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I - REPORT BY JOHN L. ANDERSON	
Introduction	208
Administration	209
Instructional Program	212
Communication	220
Residential Program	221
Summary Recommendations - Future Directions	223
Conclusion	225
APPENDIX 2 - REPORT BY BERNICE RYAN	
Introduction	226
Administrative Structure	227
Instructional Programme Review	229
Teaching Programme	230
Junior Department	230
Intermediate Department	235
Senior Department	238
Support and Ancillary Services	239
Concluding Comments	241

Page

APPENDIX 3 - REPORT BY E. MARSHALL WICK

Introduction 243

Specific Evaluation Areas 245

Benefits of Attendance at ASD 245

Instruction and Support Process 248

Staff Qualifications, Attitudes and Perceptions 252

Administration 256

Conclusions 258

Alberta School for the Deaf Evaluation Report

PART I: BACKGROUND

ORIGIN AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

1.1 1.1 INTRODUCTION

The Alberta School for the Deaf (ASD), located in the city of Edmonton, is an institution operated by the government of the province of Alberta. In the fall of 1982 the enrolment of 144 students consisted of 50 residential and 94 day students ranging in age from 5 to 18 years. A permanent staff of approximately 120 was in charge of the school in the 1982-83 fiscal year with an operating budget of approximately $4,100,000 excluding buildings and grounds. An Advisory Board served in an advisory capacity to the superintendent. An organization of parents of students in the school (The Parents' Community Council) raised funds and engaged in a number of activities.

1.2 ORIGIN AND PURPOSES OF THE EVALUATION

The Advisory Board had for several years sought to have an evaluation of ASD. In 1982 it appointed a subcommittee from among its membership to specify the terms of reference based on the following concerns identified:

1. There had not been an evaluation of the school since 1971.
2. Up-to-date internal information was required to assist and guide the activities of the Board, administration, staff and parents.
3. Relevant and objective information from external sources such as research, technology, and experience elsewhere was required.
4. A major goal of ASD was to meet the needs of the whole child. The broadly based program developed to meet these needs required examination.
5. The residential aspects of the school, particularly with reference to equipping students for life in the broad community, needed examination.

In the summer of 1982 Alberta Education authorized the evaluation. Its purpose was to provide information for use in planning, particularly decisions about features of the school which were commendable and warranted retention, and those which might require replacement or

revision. The evaluation commenced in September 1982 and was to be completed by June 15, 1983.

1.3 STEERING COMMITTEE

The Planning and Research Branch (subsequently the Planning Services Branch) of Alberta Education established a steering committee of five members, one from each of the Advisory Board, parents, teaching staff, residence staff, and Planning and Research. The purposes of the committee were to monitor progress, to make judgments about the findings and to recommend amendments to or termination of the contract. The committee also served as a sounding board, offering information and advice to the evaluators and as a reaction panel.

1.4 OUTCOMES and PROCESSES: DESCRIPTIONS and JUDGMENTS

The following evaluation questions in the terms of reference made more specific the general purposes mentioned above.

Outcomes	Descriptions and Judgments
Impact on recent graduates (last 10 years)	What have been their experience, and what should have been their experiences, with respect to a) further training opportunities b) further training involvement c) employment d) self-actualization e) quality of life f) integration with the hearing community g) retrospections of the contributions of ASD?
Impact on students currently enrolled	What are, and what should be, the benefits of attendance at ASD with respect to accomplishments in a) social development within ASD b) social development in the outside community c) personal development d) academic endeavours e) preparation for employment?

Processes	Descriptions and Judgments
Instruction, including support and ancillary services	What procedures are employed in instruction, and how appropriate and effective are instructional procedures relative to a) planning, including diagnosis of student needs,

(teaching and learning in the classrooms and residence)	setting goals and expectations b) implementation, including practices for meeting individual and group needs c) provision of support and ancilliary services d) evaluation of pupil progress e) use of pupil progress information f) reporting pupil progres information g) the rationales underpinning the above, e.g., principles, assumptions, research findings, theories of learning h) scope and sequence of curriculum followed and the congruency with the Alberta Program of Studies i) articulation of program among grades j) total communication?
Staff (classroom, residence, support, ancillary, administration)	What are, and how appropriate and effective are the characteristics of the staff with respect to a) perception of role b) self-improvement activities c) knowledge of relevant theory and practice d) their own philosophy re child development e) attitudes toward, and expectations for members of the deaf community (including understanding of, and empathy with deaf children) f) attitudes toward, and expectations for co-workers?
School Climate and community environment	What are, and what should be the characteristics of the school's climate and environment with respect to a) sense of community (within A.S.D.) b) sense of community (external to A.S.D.) c) student-student relationships d) adult-student relationships e) adult-adult relationships f) deaf staff-hearing staff relationships g) degree to which aspiration of these groups are communicated and held in common

	h) degree to which expectations of these groups are communicated and held in common?
Parents' involvement with school's programs generally and their son's/ daughter's program specifically	In what ways are parents involved, and should be involved with respect to a) scholastic development b) social development c) personal development?
A.S.D. programs for parents re knowledge and skills about parenting	What opportunities exist, and what opportunities should exist, for parental involvement? What benefits are and should be perceived by parents from A.S.D. with respect to a) one to one contacts by A.S.D. b) one to one counselling c) meetings with groups d) problem-solving, decision-making
Services and advice for parents when their children were of preschool age.	What types of services and advice were available to parents, and were accessed and used by the parents?
Administration	What are, and what should be the characteristics of administration (including Alberta Education central offices) with respect to a) policy development b) development and implementation of regulations c) supervision of staff d) coordination and articulation of programs e) communication?
Communications (two-way communication with the deaf)	What are, and what should be, the characteristics of this two-way communication regarding a) skills b) attitudes c) motivation?

The terms of reference also suggested data sources such as on-site observations, analysis of documents, interviews and questionnaires. The responsibilities severally or jointly, of the principal evaluators (Clarke and Nyberg), Alberta Education consultants, and education of the deaf specialists were specified.

1.5 DELIMITATIONS

An evaluation, like the widening circles from a stone dropped into a pool, could encompass a very wide area. Some aspects of ASD encountered during the evaluation had some impact, but were deemed not central, or were beyond the terms of reference. Others were of utmost importance but their difficulty and complexity would have required a full-blown study. Five such limitations are outlined below.

Governance of the school was one of the aspects outside of the terms of reference that was frequently mentioned by people being interviewed. Several alternatives to the present chain of authority were advanced. One was that the school should be "taken over and administered by a neighbouring school district." There were various pros and cons to be considered. Another was that the school should be made an autonomous institution like a College, the technical institutes, or universities. Financing would still be through the provincial government, but once the budget was established a Board would have the responsibility for policy and operation. The appointment and makeup of such a Board was obviously of great importance. While there were other possibilities, these two major proposals with many and varied details, were the ones most frequently heard. However, governance of the school was not in the terms of reference of the evaluation, therefore no recommendations on this aspect were made.

Another matter not part of the evaluation was that the school might be closed entirely. The purpose of the evaluation was to identify commendable features which should be continued and perhaps strengthened and to identify others which should be eliminated or changed. However, the context was that the school would remain in operation, therefore possibility of closing ASD was not considered.

A third matter related to the preceding was mainstreaming. It is obvious that this alternative would warrant a full and extended study.

However, it was also clear that if mainstreaming were extended to the deaf, there would be considerable impact on ASD. In the extreme, complete mainstreaming of the deaf would eliminate ASD but the need for a program such as is offered by ASD would continue.

A fourth matter which was not included in the terms of reference was the views of the deaf community, excepting insofar as they were involved in ASD as parents, staff, students, or graduates. This matter, like mainstreaming, was of great importance, and like the latter, warranted a full and extended study beyond the scope of the present evaluation.

A fifth matter of great importance was early intervention and preschool programs. Early intervention involves working with parents of newly identified deaf children. Evidently, repeated opportunities for parents to ask questions (and have them answered) is a key component of early intervention programs. Small group sessions, it is claimed, provide emotional support and sharing of ideas. Parental expectations and attitudes are shaped in these early years. Early intervention programs naturally lead into provisions for preschools. The beneficial effect of these early programs on subsequent development is recognized by all authorities. Neither of these (early intervention and preschool programs) was a mandate of ASD. As shown in section 4.5, of 143 students in January 1983, some 91 had commenced their schooling at ASD. Of the 143, some 93 had a record of preschool attendance. There is no escaping the fact that nearly two thirds of the students might have been in a location where early intervention and preschools were available. Both of these are present in the Greater Edmonton area. The comments heard recommended coordination among the groups responsible, and close cooperation with ASD, which was called on to continue the education of the deaf children.

2. DEAFNESS

2.1 INTRODUCTION

It is possible that some readers of this report may not be fully informed about deafness. For this reason, one or two excellent books are recommended and a few salient points are presented below.

The book by Freeman, Carbin, and Boese (1981) has many strengths. It is recent, was written by a team of Canadian experts, and was sponsored by the International Association of Parents of the Deaf. In addition various chapters were examined by international experts before publication. In general the book avoids technical language and is written so that the layman can understand it. The book by Moores (first edition 1978, second edition 1982) is scholarly, well-written, and sound, as the fact of the publication of a second edition attests. There are no doubts many other books which provide information on deafness, but the two mentioned above serve as valuable study points.

2.2 DEFINITIONS

The term "hearing impaired" has been coined to cover the range of hearing deficiency from slight to profound. The following definition of deafness is provided by Moores (1982, p. 6)

> A deaf person is one whose hearing is disabled to an extent (usually 70 dB ISO or greater) that precludes the understanding of speech through the ear alone, with or without the use of a hearing aid.

The reader should note that the hearing loss is that found over the speech range. Deafness is also divided into the severely deaf (hearing loss 70-90 decibels) and profoundly deaf (over 90 decibels).

The time at which deafness occurred is very important. The term "prelingually deaf" is applied to persons whose deafness occurred before speech was developed.

There is general agreement that deaf children as defined above "routinely require special class/school placement; routinely require special speech, hearing, language, and educational assistance". (Moores, 1982, p. 7). It should also be noted that deafness is frequently associated with other handicaps which complicate classification schemes. For example, a child with a 75 decibel hearing

loss plus other handicaps might not function as well as another with 90 decibels of hearing loss and no other handicaps. Even without additional complicating handicaps, the functioning of deaf children is not perfectly predicted by audiological tests alone.

During the evaluation some 79 interviews were conducted. Questionnaires, which had open-ended items with space for written comment were given. For further details, the reader can consult Part II PROCEDURES. It is proposed to use some of these interview or written statements to illustrate points made. For example, returning now to the difference between audiological test results and actual functioning, one parent interviewed had this to say:

> John (not his real name) has 75 and 85 decibel loss but he has good speech. This happens. An assessment based purely on audiograms wouldn't always work.

2.3 CAUSES

Freeman, Carbin, and Boese (1981, p. 58) estimate that the deafness of about half of all deaf people has a hereditary cause. Mindel and Vernon (1971, p. 25) indicate that of this hereditary deafness, 90 per cent is carried by a recessive gene. In this kind of deafness (congenital), the child is born deaf, and the severity of the deafness is unchanging.

> The lottery of genetics is such that, although this recessive gene for deafness is present in approximately one out of ten persons, only six children per ten thousand are deafened genetically. The recessive gene in one parent has to be matched by one in the other parent if a recessive trait is to appear.

If both parents carry the recessive gene for deafness, the chance of the child being born deaf is 25% or 1 in 4 for each child born. Thus, hearing parents could have two or more deaf children due to recessive genes or they might not have any.

Mindel and Vernon (1971, p. 26) observe that children who are deaf because of hereditary causes are less likely to have other handicaps than are children deaf from non-genetic causes, and that as a group, the genetically deaf do better in school. At the present stage of human knowledge, deafness from hereditary causes is not subject to prevention by medical treatment.

The second major cause of deafness is disease, particularly rubella or German measles. If a woman catches this disease during the first three months of pregnancy there is considerable likelihood that the baby will be stillborn or born deaf. In addition, other handicaps related to the virus attacking the nervous system may be associated with the deafness. A second condition which frequently causes deafness is pregnancy or birth complications such as Rh factor incompatibility, premature birth or oxygen deficiency during birth. A third cause of deafness is the disease meningitus, which has its onset after the child is born. Medical science holds out the hope that deafness caused by disease or pregnancy or birth complications can be reduced or almost eliminated.

In 1979 Gallaudet College's Office of Demographic Studies conducted a Canadian Survey of Hearing Impaired children and Youth. Alberta participation included the Calgary Board of Education, and the Association for the Hearing Impaired preschool program. Not included were Alberta Education: Multi-Sensory Handicapped Program, and the Alberta School for the Deaf. Part of Table 5 (Karchmer, Allen, Petersen and Quaynor, 1982, p. 95) is reproduced below. This sets forth the additional handicapping conditions identified in 1305 deaf students in Canadian residential schools (not including ASD) in 1979.

	N	%
Legal blindness	5	0.4
Uncorrected visual problems	51	3.9
Brain damage	35	2.7
Epilepsy	26	2.0
Orthopedic	21	1.6
Cerebral Palsy	61	4.7
Heart disorder	22	1.7
Mental retardation	54	4.1
Emotional-behavioral problem	151	11.6
Specific learning disability	109	8.4
None	846	64.8

The table shows that in 1979 some 35% of students in Canadian residential schools for the deaf had, in addition to being deaf, other handicapping conditions. It should be noted that more than one handicapping condition was occasionally reported.

About 1964-65 a very severe epidemic of rubella struck the United States, and with some time lag, Canada. Children subject to deafness as a result would be about 13 to 15 years of age in 1979, and would account for a number of the additional handicapping conditions shown in the table quoted.

In Alberta a program to vaccinate babies age 6 to 8 months, and girls at the Grade 6 level has been launched in an attempt to reduce or eliminate rubella.

2.4 INCIDENCE

It might be expected that as medical science eliminated causes of disease-borne deafness, the number of cases would decrease. However, medical science has also caused many babies who were deaf to survive. These two effects operate in opposite directions.

The rule of thumb for estimating the incidence of deafness as defined in section 2.2 was one deaf child per 1000 children. Thus, Alberta with approximately 423,000 school age children (5 to 18 years) in the fall of 1982 should have had some 423 who were deaf. Demographic surveys reveal regional differences, and for Alberta this figure is high. Instead of one per 1000 a better estimate is 75 per 100,000. This would place the number of deaf children at 317. In the 1982-83 school year, the Alberta School for the Deaf enrolled (as of October) 144 students, and the Calgary Board of Education program for the deaf enrolled 149 for a total of 293. It is probable that some deaf students were at home, or in school in various school districts.

Parents of deaf children are almost always (95% of the time) hearing. In the Canadian Survey of Hearing Impaired Children and Youth, of 1370 students in residential schools, for 50 students both parents were deaf (3.6%), for 19 students one parent only was deaf (1.4%) and for 1,301 students neither parent was deaf (95%).

The incidence of deafness is obviously affected by epidemics such as the rubella epidemic of 1964-65. There also seems to be a much smaller rhythmical five year pattern of increased incidence occurring approximately 1970, 1975, and 1980. If this is the case, about the years 1984-85 there might be an increase in school admissions of deaf children (aged 5 years).

2.5 COMMUNICATION

In its broadest sense, communication includes any behavior which is used for sending and receiving messages which involve information or feelings or both. It is often divided into verbal and non-verbal aspects. The latter includes signs, facial expressions, movements of the body, touching, and the like. For hearing people, the verbal aspect of communication becomes the most important. Language is learned "at the mother's knee" in a "consistent, relaxed, and almost unconscious manner - and in a very short time" (Moores, 1982, p. 179). It is generally agreed that an optimum time for such learning is ages two to five. The process is described by Freeman, Carbin and Boese (1981, p. 99) as follows:

> It is important to realize that children acquire language through informal exposure and through active use, not through being taught the language. The home experience is fundamental; parents function not as language teachers, but as facilitators who enable their child to absorb the culture and to make active use of their curiosity. Children use language to express feelings, to make their parents laugh, to postpone undesired events ("Can I stay up for five more minutes?"), to evade telling the truth ("Maybe I did eat the cookies - I can't remember."), and so on.

For deaf children, the process described above is prevented by the deafness. Like hearing babies, deaf babies babble, but because they cannot hear themselves, and adjust the sounds, gradually these disappear. In many cases parents do not realize at an early age that their child is deaf. In one study the average age of the child at diagnosis was 20 months. As Freeman, Carbin and Boese (1981, p. 99) note:

> For these children, early unplanned exposure to people talking has provided little or nothing in the way of language development. At age two or three, therefore, the average deaf child is not ready to concentrate on developing meaning and content, as can the hearing child or the deaf child with deaf parents.

If there is lack of communication for the first five years, this has tremendous implications for the later development of deaf children. One's native language is caught, not taught, and the peak or optimum time is ages two to five. These are the messages derived from research.

While vocabulary is only one part of language, it is readily measured. It is estimated that most deaf children start school at age 5 with a vocabularly of 50 to 500 words, while hearing children start school at age 5 with a vocabulary of 3000 to 5000 words. This is just one

illustration of the handicap of deafness.

2.6 DEAFNESS IS LIKE A LEAD BOOT

Canadians are familiar with marches to raise money for charitable purposes. Suppose that at the starting point of a march, some were picked out and fitted with a lead boot, which were not all of the same weight. Some were heavier, some were lighter. In addition, about one-third of those who were selected to receive a lead boot were also fitted with an iron boot, with pockets for sand, stones, or other weights.

After an hour of marching one would expect those not encumbered with weighted boots to be ahead. Some would be a long way ahead, others a short way. Those with lead boots would lag behind, and those with both lead and iron boots would lag most.

After several hours of marching, some of the unencumbered marchers would have completed the course. Others would have given up. Most would be spread out over a considerable distance. Those with lead boots would be far behind, also spread out. Perhaps an unusual one might have finished the course. Those with the heavier lead boots, and both lead and iron boots, would be very far behind.

The marchers all started together, but the longer they marched the further apart they got. Deafness is like a lead boot, and one-third of the deaf are also encumbered with an iron boot, that is, additional handicaps.

2.7 DEAF CULTURE

Language is perhaps the most important feature of a sub-group within a society. Canadians are quite familiar with this in a bilingual French-English country. There are parallels between the deaf and the hearing worlds, as there are between French and English Canada. The language of the deaf, especially of the profoundly deaf, is based on sight rather than sound. Their chosen language is American Sign Language. The experts now agree that it is a true language, in contrast with manually coded English, which has its place in teaching English as a way of visually representing the language.

Adult deaf people often feel very incompetent in English. They feel

more comfortable with other deaf people than with hearing people, as witnessed by the fact that of the deaf people who marry, 95 per cent marry deaf people. These facts are well expressed in comments made by two deaf persons interviewed by the principal evaluators.

*They (other deaf persons) live in our world.
*We feel more comfortable with deaf persons. The communication is there, the feeling is there, everything is the same.

They live in the same world - described by some as a "silent world".

The following portion of a paragraph further illustrates this "we-group" feeling. It is quoted from the March 1982 issue of the Deaf Canadian magazine. It was reprinted from Australia's Silent Messenger of September 1979. The author worked at the Victoria School for Deaf Children.

> When was the last time we were in a group of deaf people for no other reason than that we enjoyed their company? Why not be really honest and admit that, like most other hearing people we do not choose to become too deeply involved with deaf people because we don't really feel all that comfortable and that it is quite often frustrating and tiring? We prefer to socialize with hearing people. Strangely enough, deaf people in general feel exactly the same about us. There are usually no hard feelings or resentments on either side, it is just a fact of life which they have accepted years ago but which we, in our misguided wisdom, have not.

The "we-group" feeling illustrated in this quotation is a strong phenomenon, and has two important effects on the Alberta School for the Deaf.

The school is not regarded by the deaf community nor by its students, as is any other school. It would be a grave mistake for people to think of ASD as being "another school". It is different in the sense of being a nucleus or centre for leadership in the deaf community. There is a loyalty toward the school on the part of its students, its deaf staff, and the deaf community with roots deep in the deaf culture.

The second important effect has to do with the normal adolescent breakaway from the nest. In many families with hearing children, late adolescence is a stormy time as the children test out the limits and seek various freedoms. However, with parents of deaf children (95 per cent of whom are hearing) this normal breakaway can become poisoned for some by suspicion, suspicion that their children are being "stolen away from them by the deaf community" as more than one

parent was heard to say. In fact, in many cases the widened rift between parents and deaf children is aggravated by difficulties in communication. If the deaf child cannot readily communicate with his or her parents, it is not surprising that they get closer to the people with whom such communication is easy, normal, and natural, namely, the deaf community. As a parent (of a deaf child) put it.

> Is he happy? That's his school. It is the best school to John (age 17, not his real name). Don't say anything against ASD. John wouldn't like it. Kids like to be with kids they can talk to. Deaf kids want to be together. Kids are happy to go home but always happy to get back.

Additional quotations from parents of students in ASD, taken from the "open-ended" portions of the parent questionnaire illustrate the points just made. Each asterisk marks the views of a different parent.

*Interaction with other deaf children and deaf adults is very positive.
*ASD is an excellent centre for any hearing impaired students to communicate more freely and easily among themselves.
*(ASD provides a) social community and peer group for deaf persons.
*Sociability of the deaf students. They would find it difficult to socialize with "fast pacing" hearing peers in the public schools. They would always be left out.
*I feel that the only good thing I can say about the school is that it offers the students the chance to socialize with their deaf peers.
*(ASD provides a) community and educational centre for the deaf.
*All students have an equal opportunity to participate in sports and extra curricular activities with no language barriers.
*All students going to ASD are deaf and therefore don't have anyone to mimick them because they are different.
*(one of the good features of ASD is) the community that the children live in. Where else could a deaf person have 150 people to share with and accept responsibilities that are inherent in a sub-community?
*I think it is a very grave mistake to close down ASD to intermingle the deaf and the hearing in school. It will not work. Why was ASD built in the first place? You have to understand the problem of deafness. Why not ask some deaf adults who were produced by ASD to see what they think of the school and get feedback from them about deaf students going to ASD or a hearing school.

Because the flavor of many of the above quotations is to extol the virtues of ASD, at this time one contrary opinion is quoted. The list of this kind of sentiment could be even longer than the preceding one in favour of ASD as it is.

> There should be a good integration program with the hearing schools as these deaf children have to learn how to "make it in the hearing

world" some day.

A quotation illustrating what parents say about their children (usually of the age group 16-18) breaking away from the nest follows. It is from a deaf father.

> It is probably true that hearing parents are concerned that students drift away from them. If the parent cannot sign they cannot communicate with their children so the child finds it more comfortable to be with his deaf friends. I have two (hearing) children. At about age 14-16 they want their own friends, don't pay much attention to parents. This is the same whether parents are deaf (we are) or if the opposite were true.

Another quotation from a representative of the deaf community is this.

> The deaf aren't trying to "ensure" that deaf children will be in the deaf world - this choice is up to the children! What they are trying to ensure is that deaf children get a <u>better</u> education and <u>better</u> employment under the <u>best</u> conditions conducive to their development. In other words the deaf believe that the deaf child can get better all around development in an environment that is least restricted than is that of the deaf child in a public school. The parents don't understand this, but I <u>do</u>. I have experienced the difficulties of trying to make it through public schools.
> There are a great many deaf persons who live in the <u>hearing world</u> in terms of employment, living in a neighbourhood full of hearing people, having hearing children, etc. and then meet with deaf people on a social basis. It is no different from the Polish-Canadians who work and live as others do and who go to their local Polish club.

Another short quotation from the same person follows.

> "Growing away" from parents is a normal adolescent process! That isn't unique to the deaf!

Back to a parent account of student reaction.

> John (not his real name) does think the school is good. He really enjoys it. He hasn't many friends in the hearing world.

These quotations illustrate that the deaf have a strong "we-group" feeling. ASD is not regarded by the deaf community nor by its students as is a regular school. It is a home, a nucleus or centre of the deaf community and commands a loyalty not often found in the constituents of other schools.

3. PARENTS OF DEAF CHILDREN

3.1 FIRST REACTIONS

> When deafness is finally diagnosed, hearing parents who are unfamiliar with deafness are usually panic-stricken. Their first thought is to "normalize" the child, to make him behave as much like a child with perfect hearing as possible, (Jacobs, 1980, p. 10).

The panic mentioned by Jacobs is described as shock by other authors. A mixture of fear, anger, grief, disbelief, guilt, and shame - all powerful emotions - may flood over the parents. Questions such as "why did this happen to me?" cross parents' minds. Some overprotect. Because they do not understand, some will not accept that the deafness may be hereditary, despite the fact that about half of all deafness is. They see fault or taint, not understanding that approximately one person in ten carries the recessive gene for deafness, which by the chance coupling of genes, produces about six deaf children in ten thousand.

The interviews revealed many of these feelings. For example, a mature and insightful teacher aide at ASD made the following observations in an interview.

> A lot of parents are embarrassed when they are out and their kids are signing. Brothers and sisters have a lot of feelings; for example, am I going to have a deaf kid. Parents don't know how to deal with the deaf child. They buy things for them, or pay more attention to them.

3.2 SECOND REACTIONS

Many parents who were interviewed spoke of the extra burden that a deaf child causes.

> Sometimes it is frustrating. You are cleaning or washing dishes and you have to stop and tell them on your hands! Everything seems to stop for them.

Another parent, with experience with a deaf child of her own and with two foster children (one acquired at the age of a few days) made these observations.

> When you get a deaf kid it is hard to accept it. You don't know what to do. You never feel you are going to know the kid. It is devastating. It is so hard to learn to sign.

Another parent expressed a deep-felt fear, echoed by several.

> I am one scared parent because I really wonder what is going to happen to my son. I don't want him to land on social assistance. (The son was 16 years old).

Another father, a successful businessman, said this.

> In the early years, parents should rely on someone else to make decisions about what is good for the child - parents are too personally involved. But by age 14 parents have accepted. They know.

Again a father, and again a successful businessman.

> Parents (of a deaf child) have a real guilt feeling - each thinks the other was responsible. Emotion or feeling runs high - almost becomes irrational. Others give up and become apathetic.

These are some graphic, firsthand descriptions of reaction to having a deaf child.

3.3 PARENTAL EXPECTATIONS

It has already been noted in section 3.1 that a strong tendency in hearing parents of a deaf child is to try to make the child as normal as possible. Many parents of students at ASD expressed this wish, with respect to speech, written English, and achievement in other school subjects. Here are some examples from interviews.

*John (not his real name, a boy of 16) would like to get a Ph.D. and be involved in the space program. I would support his goals - reach for the sky, and if you only get to the roof that's O.K.

*One thing a deaf child must be able to do is communicate in the English language. There are kids (at ASD) who have a Grade 3 or 4 or 5 English language level - this is one of the things that make me most mad. We have to graduate these kids with Grade 12 English whatever it takes.

*There are often violent arguments among parents based on parents of younger children believing they will become "normal".

*It makes me so angry that there is such a beautiful school but they are not putting anything into the kids' heads.

*The students (at ASD) are so far behind public school students - I don't see why they can't learn even though they are deaf. They are not pushing them for their potential.

*I don't see why they can't learn English as good as any other kid.

*The expectations, and the knowledge parents have of deafness is very low. When students graduate from ASD what can they do? ___'s 19 year old son cannot even write a sentence. But I don't think students can graduate with a Grade 12 education. That's unrealistic to me. It is difficult to explain to parents of older children why their child isn't writing good English.

*My philosophy is that the deaf can be educated. They can be the same as anyone else. There are morons and genuises (among the hearing and among the deaf), so they can be educated like anyone else. You have to accept that they can be taught.

*Parents want higher academic standards.

Further examples, taken from the open-ended "suggestions for improving ASD" on the questionnaire for parents follow.

*Students graduating in June 1983 as in the past few years will be let out into the hearing world very frustrated - wouldn't we hearing people feel the same if we left school with an equivalent average of a 5.5 reading level??
*I see no earthly reason why the standards at the school cannot be brought up higher.
*Expect more of the students and they will do more - they are not incapable and they want to learn.

It is clear that the "reach for the stars" opening quotation is echoed and reechoed in the expectations of these parents, who expect deaf students to walk as fast and as far as hearing students, despite lead and perhaps also iron boots.

3.4 NEED FOR PARENT EDUCATION

Parents in general wholeheartedly agree that there is such a need. As can be seen in section 6.1, item 14 on the questionnaire for parents was "There is a great need for more parent education". The responses obtained were as follows. Strongly disagree 1, Disagree 3, Neither agree nor disagree 13, Agree 39, Strongly agree 29, Don't know 5. Parents resoundingly endorsed the statement, with 68 out of 90, or approximately 75.5 percent agreeing. The same item was on other questionnaires and was strongly endorsed by teachers and houseparents.

There is general agreement that parent education must start as early as possible. As so graphically stated by the parents quoted in section 3.1, there is frequently a strong emotional reaction when parents find that their child is deaf. It is hard to accept. If, in an effort to console, someone indicates that the child will get over the deafness and hear normally, a false hope may be planted which will last for a long time. The hope alone would not necessarily be bad, but it may well prevent the acceptance of deafness which studies have shown to be so important in the development of the deaf child.

An astute observer who was interviewed (himself deaf) observed that the emotional shock is greater for those who have never been exposed to deafness, or do not know anything about deafness.

A hearing mother who had a deaf cousin was much more able to accept her own son's deafness than a mother who had never met a deaf person in all her life.

Parents were acutely aware of the need for parent education. For example:

> Parents need an opportunity to come together to share ideas and to express needs.

Teachers frequently spoke of the need for parent education.

> Some parents are very well meaning but they need a lot of education about their children's deafness. They sure need it. Some of them expect us to pour language into their children and it doesn't work that way.

3.5 THE PARENTS' COMMUNITY COUNCIL

This group of parents in 1982-83 was in its fifth active year. It had an executive committee of 8 members, a membership fee of $3.00 per year, and in October 1982 had 24 paid up members out of a possible 133. The name was chosen to facilitate tax-exemption for donations. Funds were raised to purchase teletypewriters (TTY) and television decoders for each student and for ASD. The Council claims that by the fall of 1982 it had placed in homes and in the School approximately 250 TTY's at $525.00 each and 200 decoders at $310.00 each at a total cost of some $193,000. As stated in a document entitled "History of the ASD Community Council".

> This alone we feel gives us just cause to feel proud as it is our understanding we are the only parent group in Canada or the U.S.A. to accomplish such an undertaking.

A number of teachers commended the Council for this work. Other activities were described in the History. In conjunction with the YMCA, "Camp Make Believe" was sponsored. This offered deaf and hearing children an opportunity to integrate in a day-camp situation. It supplied summer employment for 25 senior ASD students and is sponsored each year. Funds were raised from four flea markets, two arts and crafts sales, raffles, and other fund-raising projects. These funds were used to provide assistance to the students council, graduate classes, leadership groups; for bursaries; and to support athletes attending the Deaf Olympics. At Christmas 1982 plasticized identification cards were provided for all students. The Council also helped find summer employment for eleven senior students.

During the summer of 1982 one of the main thrusts of officials of the Council was to present to officials of ASD and of the government various concerns about ASD. On July 14 a meeting was held and a letter sent to the Minister of Education. On July 23 the President and Past President of the Parents' Community Council met with the

Director of Special Educational Services of Alberta Education, and the Superintendent and Principal of ASD. On August 27 a meeting with the Minister of Education expressed a number of concerns. These were reported to all parents in a communication from the Parents' Community Council, dated July 7, 1982, as follows.

Curriculum
- The new Hearing Impaired Curriculum was to have been piloted this term but was not adhered to throughout the school.

Quality of Education
- Inadequate grading system (report cards).
- Credit System introduced verbally but not practiced.
- Lack of motivation to a student in a learning system.
- Teachers using American Sign Language (Ameslan - slang) rather than English as outlined on Page 18 of the Hearing Impaired Curriculum Guide (see attached).
- No continuity and control of subject matter from year to year. i.e. students repeat same work year after year.
- Improvement in the ratio of hearing and non-hearing staff for individual students.
- Only qualified teachers should be allowed to teach Language Arts.
- Inadequate opportunities and facilities in the Pre-Vocational Training area.
- Inadequate structured exams.
- Math, Language, Reading and Spelling should be taught and in the a.m.
- Minimal assistance given students enrolled in correspondence courses.

Teachers
- Lack of professional certification and upgrading of some teachers.
- Qualified team from the Education Department to evaluate teachers performance on a regular basis.
- Career counselling starts far too late in the student's life.

Others
- "Signing of Undertaking" (consent forms) for parents is obsolete. (see attached).
- Total Communication is not used throughout the school.
- Need for organized activity within the surrounding community - integration in social function, sports, etc.
- Upgrading and higher standard of houseparents qualifications.
- Communicating of information to parents in distant areas.
- Higher emphasis from staff on Speech Therapy.
- All parents should be completely cognizant of the new program called Family Life Education (Sex Education curriculum).

The Minister of Education attended the meeting of the ASD Advisory Board held on September 23, 1982. The minutes record that the above concerns were addressed by the Minister in the following directives.

A. Changes to Membership

i. Alberta Social Services and Community Health have withdrawn

their representation. An additional parent representative will fill this position to maintain the size of the Board.
ii. The Alberta Education representative will no longer be designated as a Chairman. The board was instructed to select a lay member from its membership to be Chairman.

B. Reorganization of Alberta Education
Effective January 1, 1983 the School will be under the functional jurisdiction of the Associate Deputy Minister for Program Delivery, Dr. Odynak, to whom the superintendent will report.

C. Mandate of the Advisory Board
i. The Board is to advise the Superintendent on all aspects of policy relating to the operation of the School.
ii. The advice of the Board should be clearly expressed in the minutes of the meetings.
iii. The Board will determine the agenda and identify matters appropriate for discussion.

D. Role of Chairman
i. To call meetings - The Ministerial Order requires that the Board meet at least three times during the year.
ii. To prepare the agenda.
iii. To communicate with the Superintendent and stakeholder groups.

E. Evaluation of the School and Future Directions
The planned evaluation will commence in September 1982. The Report is expected to be completed by June 1983.
The Minister indicated that the Board should look to change, enhance or extend its mandate. Such changes, in conjunction with pertinent recommendations made within the context of reorganization would be responded to positively by the Minister. However, the Minister advised that this should not be done within the next three or four months.

F. Importance of the Advisory Board
The Minister deemed that the Board is of vital interest, and that it is derived from policy recommendations.
The Advisory Board was also informed of certain directions in the following areas for the Alberta School for the Deaf for the 1982-83 school year.

Curriculum and Evaluation
(a) Use of the Curriculum Guide for the Hearing Impaired and the approved Alberta Program of Studies is mandatory in all classes at the School. Assistance will be provided to teachers to ensure that this practice will be successfully followed in the classroom.
(b) All Alberta School for the Deaf pupils will participate in a program of standardized testing on an annual basis. Parents will be informed in an understandable way of their children's results and the meaning of these results.
(c) All Alberta School for the Deaf pupils will be regularly tested to determine their level of classroom achievement. Pupils will also be taught appropriate review and study practice.
(d) All Alberta School for the Deaf pupils in the academic stream will participate in the Alberta mandatory achievement testing program.
(e) All Alberta School for the Deaf pupils and their parents will

be advised at the beginning of the school year of credit opportunities available and whether these credits have been earned at the end of each year.
(f) This credit system will be implemented for pupils at the Grade X level in 1982-83, at the Grade XI level in 1983-84, and the Grade XII level in 1984-85.
(g) All Alberta School for the Deaf pupils enrolled in correspondence courses will receive regular tutorial and follow-up assistance in school. Parents will be informed of the pupil's progress in correspondence courses.

Total Communication
(a) English is the language of instruction at the Alberta School for the Deaf. Total communication using a signed English system is to be used as the mode of instruction at the School. All teachers are to teach using a manually coded English form and pupils are to respond in the same manner. All hearing teachers and other staff are to speak as well as use manual communication, and deaf teachers and other staff are to use speech movement as well as manual communication.
(b) Speech therapy will be improved and will be provided in conjunction with other activities in the school.

Relationship with Parents
(a) The responsibility of the school is to enhance the relationship between the school and parents; all staff at the School should encourage parental contact.
(b) It is the responsibility of the designated contact for each pupil to make telephone contact with parents to discuss the pupil's progress at least once during September, and once every two months after.
(c) Houseparents are responsible for contacting the parents of such residential pupil by telephone or letter at least once per month, and as appropriate.
(d) Report cards are to be regularly sent to parents. Report cards are to contain results of standardized and achievement testing, pupil attendance, comments by teachers, and a portion for parents to offer their own comments regarding the report card.
(e) Specific career counselling will be available for all pupils fifteen years of age and older.

Subsequent to the Minister's presentation, members of the Board voiced related concerns and questions:

A.. Teacher Inspection
It was suggested that there should be a system of teacher inspection to ensure that policies were implemented. The Minister indicated his support of regular teacher evaluation but pointed out that these may be negatively construed. What has to be done is to involve teachers and staff, and to teach and assure them that any model of development is meant to be constructive and developmental rather than negative or repressive. The Minister acknowledged that this would be a difficult task, but one that had to be done, since there would be no justification for deferring it.

B. Time Line for Credit System

Members perceived the time-line for the implementation of the credit system as being "farsighted" and ambitious. There was a concern that pupils would have difficulty reaching a high school level. The Minister agreed pupils would have difficulty reaching that level but that such a goal was not impossible.

The Minister noted that:
- the school may have suffered from benign neglect by the Department of Education, the Minister and the community at large.
- the Administration may not have clearly understood the intentions of the Department.
- the School is valued, and what is being done is in the best interest of the School.
- the aim is to provide each pupil with a good education.

The Minister was of the opinion that students can be generally academically prepared to a point at which a credit system becomes a mechanical proposition. If this is not the case, then we must acknowledge that the pupils are not comparable to those in school systems in the province. However, the Minister has no indication that pupils at the School are not comparable. If the evaluation demonstrates this is so, then the Minister will extend the time line on a reasonable basis. In the meantime, there will be a time line. The Minister declared that the School has a rich opportunity in terms of budget, staff and the physical plant, and hence he was not prepared to accept that the students were not ready, or could not make the adjustment to a credit system.

Budget

The question regarding funding for implementation of services was raised. The Minister indicated that the Department would revert to prior practice in staffing. A memo has been sent to the Deputy regarding this. With careful allocation of human resources, staff involvement in evaluation, setting of priorities, and the coordinated efforts of the Administration, the School, the Advisory Board, and the Department, goals will be achieved.

Communication Between Deaf Teachers and Hearing Parents

Interpreters will be available on "meet-the-teacher-night" and other occasions. Every parent has a telephone device for communication with deaf people.

High School Teachers

There are certified teachers in the School so credit courses may be offered on the same basis as other schools in the province.

Function of the Advisory Board

The two key words for the Board would be "Policy" and "Advisory". The Board may go beyond its Advisory role and be a de facto Board, but not in advance of the evaluation. However, the Board should be aware of its scope and keep it in mind for future consideration. The Minister feels the Board should not be involved in the day-to-day operation of the School, but in policy decisions that have implications for the School. The Board must make decisions on what is policy and appropriate for discussion. It is the responsibility

of the Advisory Board and the administration to ensure that policies were carried out, if not, the Special Educational Services Branch would intervene to see that things were done.

Method of Communication in the School

The use of English as the language of instruction is the re-affirmation of an existing policy which pre-dates the Advisory Board. The Minister feels that since English is the language of the Province it is essential that the pupil be educated using English, and that teachers use English as a first Language of instruction. However, if the Board would like to make a proposition that ASL be used as a distinct language, then the Minister would be prepared to consider such a proposal for bilingual instruction in controlled circumstances. The Minister expressed interest in the unique situation where bilingual instruction must be used, but does not accept that children cannot learn in English. The responsibility of the School is to teach English, and deafness should not be used as an excuse to avoid the attempt.

At this point in the meeting, the Minister concluded his remarks and left the meeting.

The Alberta School for the Deaf, staff, Advisory Board, and students all felt the impact of the Minister's directives. A sincere and earnest effort was being made to implement them. As the evaluation started in the fall of 1982 changes were being effected. What was being evaluated was either historical (how things had been) or what was coming into effect (how things will be). There is no doubt that all of the evaluators felt this air of change.

4. THE ALBERTA SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF

4.1 HISTORY

Prior to the mid 50's, deaf children in Alberta were sent to Quebec, British Columbia, and Saskatchewan to attend school. Parents of deaf children, and other interested individuals and groups mounted considerable pressure for an Alberta school, which culminated with an Order in Council dated July 6, 1953, initiating construction. As explained by W.H. Swift, then Deputy Minister of Education, no Alberta educator with knowledge of and preparation in deafness education was available and no other could be obtained, so a respected Alberta educator, Mr. L.A. Broughton, was hired as Principal. He toured Canada and the United States and strongly influenced the plans of the building.

The first 26 students moved into the partially completed junior wing in November 14, 1955. By November 1, 1956, the entire school was in operation.

Kelly Boesen, in a document entitled "The Next 25 Years" provides the following historical account.

> The school was built to be completely residential and education was of the total immersion type. The children slept in dormitories and received instruction in communication all their waking hours. The school was supplied with a complete kitchen, laundry, dining rooms, hospital and dental surgery, and at times a barber shop and beauty parlor. Even a Tuck shop where children could purchase their confectionery items was included. Nearby all of the children's physical, medical, recreational, educational, and spiritual needs were attended to within the walls of the school

This pattern was typical of North America at the time. The school was residential, with a capacity of 144 beds. Even though a student's home was nearby, the student would be in residence. Persons familiar with the school say that it was "more oral than even the oral schools of that time".

In the 1970's this oral emphasis gave way to total communication as the philosophy of learning. The residence requirement was dropped, and more and more students became day students.

4.2 PREVIOUS STUDIES

Reports of these studies were obtained, perused, and notes were made.

They were made available to the Alberta Education Consultants and the External Specialists who took part in the evaluation.

1. "Report of the Department of Education on The Alberta School for the Deaf, by Nick Andruski and team of evaluators, June 1971. 31 pages.

2. "Feasibility Study on The Alberta School for the Deaf" by W. Niemann, June, 1973. 92 pages.

3. "The Education of the Deaf in Alberta", a discussion paper prepared by the directorate of Special Educational Services, August 1974. 20 pages.

3.1 Report on a workshop based on a discussion paper. The workshop was held May 24, 1975. It included speeches, small group sessions with reports, and an evaluation. The report covers all of these topics, and is dealt with at length in document #7

4. "A Survey of Reactions to Certain Statements Made in the Discussion Paper on the Education of the Deaf in Alberta" June, 1975. A 22 page report of 62 responses to the six main statements in the discussion paper.

5. Report of Team Evaluating the Learning Centre, The Alberta School for the Deaf by Richard G. Brill; Ann Kennedy; and Harold McNeil, June, 1979. 43 pages.

6. "Anniversay, The Alberta School for the Deaf, 25 Years". A compilation of reactions on the 25th anniversary of A.S.A. 113 pages.

7. "The Next 25: Long Range Plans for The Alberta School for the Deaf" by K.W. Boesen, Superintendent. 62 pages.

8. "Academic and Vocational Education for Deaf Children". The Alberta School for the Deaf. 8 page pamphlet.

9. "The Seventy-Sixth Annual Report, 1980-81". Alberta Education Report on The Alberta School for the Deaf. pages 34 and 35.

10. Alberta Survey of the Hearing Impaired: Progress Report, April, 1982. Alberta Survey of the Hearing Impaired: Progress Report, August 10, 1982.

As reported by Boesen, the discussion paper and the conferences of the mid 1970's (3, 3.1, and 4 above) identified these problems:

1. Many children must leave home to attend ASD.

2. The program at the school tends to be isolated from the mainstream of education.

3. The school building was designed as a complete environment for deaf children living away from home. As concepts of education of the deaf changed, some parts of the building became non-functional and were converted to other uses,

The major recommendation was that ASD continue to operate in its present facilities. Another recommendation proposed decentralization

by phases. A third, directed at ASD, recommended that the Superintendent continue to explore ways to mitigate the institutionalism and isolation attributed to dormitory living. A fourth recommendation proposed that ASD provide an early intervention program both within the school and in the child's home.

It would appear that active consideration had been given to phasing out ASD but as a result of further study this idea was abandoned. It has been reported that in B.C. a similar course was investigated and also not pursued. While it is never easy to identify causes of social phenomena, perhaps the rise of mainstreaming was a strong contributing factor in the questioning of the need for the continued existence of ASD.

4.3 BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Constructed in the mid 50's, the school is mainly a one storey structure, 880 feet long erected over a full, high ceilinged basement. The gymnasium and auditorium and part of the North wing, are two storeys high. Niemann, an architect, studied possible alternate uses of the building and reported in 1973. He gave this description of the building:

> Dining room and service wing separate the senior and junior wings each of which contains classrooms and has attached dormitory wings. Offices and shop wing are connected with the senior wing. The former hospital on the second floor over parts of the senior wing now accommodates the Learning Centre. Small mezzanine areas exist in the shop wing.

Niemann reported overall floor space as 76,090 sq. ft. in the basement, 72,480 sq. ft. on the main floor, and 7,170 sq. ft. in the mezzanine and second floor, with 15,382 sq. ft. being allocated to service areas (mechanical, electrical, kitchen, laundry, incinerator, gas meter). He also reported that "the building is spotless and appears to be in an excellent state of repair", which condition held in 1982. It is generally accepted that the building, although spread out, is an excellent one. As the use to which it was put evolved over the years, the interior has been remodelled and modified.

Of six houses originally erected for staff three have been converted to group houses for resident students.

The school and its houses are located on a 33 acre site adjacent to the University of Alberta farm on the West, other government property on the North, and the City of Edmonton roads and private property on the other two sides. The school is indeed fortunate to have such a spacious site.

4.4 ADMINISTRATION

When the evaluation commenced in October of 1982 the school, operated directly by the government, had a chain of authority as follows: Minister, Deputy Minister, Associate Deputy Minister, Director of Special Education, Superintendent (K.W. Boesen). There was also an advisory Board. The Superintendent's office was in the school, where seven other administrators were housed: a Bursar, an acting Dean of Residence, a Principal, a Vice-Principal, and three Teacher Seniors. It was not at all clear whether the latter three should be classed as administrators.

Within the school, the Superintendent was responsible for the total school program. The Principal was responsible for evaluating teachers, and for a variety of other tasks. The Vice-Principal was in charge of support services and reported directly to the Superintendent. This sketchy outline will not be expanded here as Administration was the topic of a Consultant's Report.

During the course of the evaluation the Superintendent resigned to take up a position in South Dakota, as of January 1, 1983. In addition, a reorganization in Alberta Education changed the structure thereby creating three new Assistant Deputy Ministers (making four in total) and changing the person of the Associate to which the school reported. An acting Superintendent was appointed for the month of January, and a different acting Superintendent February 1, 1983 to January 31, 1984. Change was the order of the day.

The Advisory Board remained advisory, but the expectations was that it would take a stronger position in determining policy. This Board had been in existence for several years. It consisted of ten members: three being Civil Servants (one appointed by each of the Ministers of Education, Advanced Education, and Social Services and Community Health). The other seven members were appointed by the Minister of Education: two deaf adults, four parents of students attending ASD,

and a member of the general public. The Advisory Board was to advise the Superintendent about policy. He was an ex-officio (non-voting) member of the Board.

Being a government-operated school, ASD had General Regulations, Admission Policies and Procedures, School Services, Fees and Charges to Students, Special Accounts, and two schedules "Undertaking of Parent or Guardian" and "Transportation Grants" under the Regulations of the Department of Education Act.

As was explained in section 3.5, the Minister of Education met with the Board at its first meeting of the 1982-83 school year. The directives he established for the school, taken from the minutes of the Board, are listed in section 3.5. These directives initiated a series of changes which were taking place while the evaluation was going on. By analogy, the evaluation was like shooting at a moving target.

4.5 STUDENTS

As the name, Alberta School for the Deaf, implies, the school serves the whole of the province of Alberta. It also serves the Yukon and Northwest Territories. As of October, 1982, there were 50 residential students (22 girls and 28 boys) and 94 day students (36 girls and 58 boys), for a total enrollment of 144. A rough approximation of the geographic origin of students can be provided from the addresses given. It should be borne in mind that foster parents are likely to be located in Edmonton, and that many parents with deaf children moved to Edmonton because of the school. In the fall of 1982 there were 84 students whose addresses were in the greater Edmonton area, including Sherwood Park, St. Albert, Ardrossan, and Spruce Grove. There were 30 students from 24 places south of highway 16, Jasper-Edson-Edmonton-Vegreville-Lloydminster, and 30 from 27 places on or north of this highway.

Of the 143 students in attendance during April 1983, there were 120 who were profoundly deaf with a puretone average hearing loss in both ears of 91 decibels or more. Fourteen were severely deaf (puretone average hearing loss in the better ear 70 to 90 decibels), and the remainder had other complications.

Students ranged in age from five to 18 years. They were in three streams: General (academic or credit students), Basic (students having difficulty mastering school work) and Modified (students with secondary handicapping conditions).

An attempt was made to ascertain length of stay in ASD and student migration. In January, 1983 the attendance was 143, with 57 students in the Junior Department (ages 5 to 12) and 86 in the intermediate/senior/pre-vocational departments. Of the 57 students in the Junior Department: 43 had taken all of their schooling at ASD, 44 had a record of pre-school attendance, and 14 had attended other schools for the deaf. Of the 43 who had taken all of their schooling at ASD 36 had a record of pre-school attendance.

As might be expected, population mobility being what it is, out of the 86 students in the intermediate/senior/pre-vocational departments, proportionately fewer started their schooling at ASD. The number was 48. Preschool for these older students would have occurred in the 1960's, but despite the paucity of programs available, 49 had a record of pre-school attendance. Of the 86, there were 49 who had attended some other school, some of which were not schools for the deaf. When the levels were combined, it was found that 91 of the 143 students at ASD had taken all of their schooling there.

From 1974 to the end of 1982, there were 131 students who graduated from ASD as follows (Note the fluctuations):

1974 - 16	1977 - 15	1980 - 6
1975 - 9	1978 - 5	1981 - 14
1976 - 15	1979 - 25	1982 - 24

It is well known that Gallaudet College, Washington, D.C. is an institution of higher learning for deaf students. In the period 1974 to the end of 1982, there were 65 ASD students who either took the Gallaudet College Entrance Examination or were granted admission via high scores on the Gallaudet Diagnostic Examination. Of these 65, there were 25 who failed (19 of whom were not in the academic, but rather in the pre-vocational program). Of the 40 who passed, in the period 1974 to 1982 these figures provide follow-up information.

Graduated from Gallaudet College	5
Enrolled as of fall, 1982	12

Attended and transferred	2
Did not attend	5
Plan to attend	9
Attended and dropped out	7

Attendance at Gallaudet College was funded by the Manpower Services Division, Alberta Advanced Education and Manpower, Government of Alberta.

In the spring of 1982, Gallaudet College enrolled a total of 96 Canadian students as follows:

British Columbia	5	Quebec	7
Alberta	18	New Brunswick	-
Saskatchewan	10	Nova Scotia	6
Manitoba	5	Prince Edward Island	1
Ontario	44	Newfoundland	-

These figures clearly show that proportionate to its size, Alberta sends more students to Gallaudet than does any other province.

This section on students concluded with a few statements made by stakeholders, starting with positive reactions by a teacher on the open-ended item of the questionnaire "good things about ASD".

> ASD has an excellent record for educating deaf students academically. It has made many progressive innovations, for example, it was one of the first schools in North America to use Total Communication. Students who have left ASD have generally been well-rounded individuals suited to useful employment and ready to enjoy a happy life. Mr. Roger Carver estimated that about 75-85 percent of deaf adults in the job market in Alberta are presently employed.

The next quotation is from a parent. It too, was on the open-ended questionnaire item "good things about ASD".

> There are some wonderful people at ASD who have helped my son overcome frustrations and insecurities of being a profoundly deaf person.

There were also brickbats, in describing what happened to students. The first is from an interview with a parent.

> Every time there is a graduation I nearly cry - some of them are fantastic kids and are leaving with nothing.

The second critical comment is from a teacher, on the open-ended item of the questionnaire "needed improvements".

> Our greatest single problem is the immaturity of our students. Most of them do not become serious until their last year and

miracles are expected of the school. As one of our former students put it, a deaf student can keep up with a hearing student.

4.6 TEACHERS

Excluding the Superintendent, Principal and Vice-Principal, there were 45 teachers on staff at ASD in the fall of 1982. This figure included a part-time teacher-librarian, part-time teacher-guidance counsellor, three teaching seniors, and 3 teachers away on educational leave.

The Teacher Salary Qualification Service provided the following evaluation of years of teacher education for salary purposes, as of December 1982.

Less than four years	2
four years	10
five years	18
six years	7
	37

The Superintendent evaluated the years of teacher education of the remainder as follows, as of December 1982.

Less than four years	2
Four or more years	2
Five or more years	2
	6

The Superintendent classified the deaf training status of the teaching staff in December, 1982 as follows:

Untrained (three full time, academic permanent teachers, plus nine teaching home economics, industrial arts, multi-handicapped, physical education, etc.)	12
Partially trained (seven of these are actively pursuing teacher of the deaf training)	10
Fully trained	23
	45

The certification of the teachers as of December, 1982 was as follows:

Letter of authority	7
Temporary certificate	0
Interim certificate	12
Permanent certificate	25
In process	1
	45

The years of teaching experience at ASD to June 1983 of staff currently teaching was as follows. Teacher seniors are included.

One or two years	8	11-15 years	6
3-4 years	7	16-20 years	4
5-7 years	6	Over 20 years	2
8-10 years	7		

As might be expected in a province which commenced a teacher education program for teachers of the deaf in 1980, many of the teachers obtained their teacher of the deaf training in the United States.

Trained in U.S.A.	12
Trained in Canada, other than University of Alberta	8
Trained in Canada, at the University of Alberta	7
Trained in other countries	3

The deployment of the teachers who were actively teaching was as follows, in the fall of 1982.

Teacher senior	3
Junior Department	12
Intermediate-Senior	12
Pre-Vocational	10
All levels (P.E. teachers)	2

The statistics presented so far paint a lifeless picture of the teaching staff. The human warmth, the enthusiasm, the caring, the compatibility do not show up in the numbers - and neither does the tiredness, the discouragement, the disillusion, the hurt. As would be true of any thirty-nine teachers, some were acclaimed as excellent and others were branded as very inferior.

Of the teachers on staff at ASD in the fall of 1982, there were 11 who were deaf. It was stated with considerable conviction by persons in a position to know, that ASD had the highest proportion of deaf teachers of any residential deaf school in Canada. Many pros and cons about deaf teachers were heard during the evaluation.

At this point, parents' views about teachers at ASD will be illustrated by quoting all of the comments made by those parents who were in the random sample interviewed. Of the fourteen, exactly half mentioned teachers and the other half did not.

*This year I haven't met the teachers but he has had some very good teachers in the past. I never had any complaints about the teachers he has had.

*There are some teachers who need a refresher course, so that they would be willing to help the kids a little extra. Some teachers need a more positive attitude. There are too many deaf teachers. I don't say they are not qualified. They slip into ASL.

*Some teachers give the strap to the children here- old fashioned and not good for the kids.

*John (not his real name) had seven deaf teachers at one time - and I don't think a deaf teacher can properly teach. Our

teachers are getting pretty old. They have been there a long time. I have nothing against deaf teachers but they should be teacher aides first. The deaf teachers can't read or write or teach others tc read and write and unless you can read or write you can't make it in the hearing world. Ms. X (a teacher) kept them moving - gave them homework and saw to it that it was done. She is a dedicated all round teacher, but she is having her troubles.

*Many teachers figure that students can only reach the Grade 5 level so they don't try very hard. Ms. X (a teacher) seems super. She keeps everyone active. ASD needs better qualified teachers. Teacher attitude needs improving. A lot of them are there because they need the pay cheque. There should be a limit on deaf teachers in a total communication school, and certainly they should not be assigned to language arts.

*There are some strong feelings about deaf teachers in ASD but my own kid does better with the deaf teachers.

The open-ended items on the questionnaires gave parents a clear opportunity to voice their opinions on any aspects of ASD. There were many comments which dealt with teachers and teaching, most of which were laudatory. Others were critical. Since instruction will be considered in detail in Part IV FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS further illustrations will not be provided here.

4.7 RESIDENCES AND RESIDENCE STAFF

An excellent description of the residence provisions is found in Appendix I under the heading "4. Residential Program". For this reason an abbreviated description will be given, rounded out by parents' comments.

The numbers of students in the residences varied from time to time. The following figures are representative of the fall of 1982. The dormitories housed 32 students, 20 boys and 12 girls. Senior students were able to live in groups of six in three on-campus houses, and 12 girls and 6 boys were so doing. In addition, when a student reached 18 years he or she was expected to live in the off-campus housing program. There were four boys involved in this program in the fall of 1982. In total, there were 50 students in the on-campus residential program and four in the off-campus housing program. It must be remembered that these figures changed somewhat with time.

The staff of 17 houseparents were allocated as follows: six to the

three on-campus houses, ten to the dormitories, and one served as senior housekeeper (acting Dean of Residence). There were five child care attendants for daytime supervision of students. The off-campus living program was supervised by a social worker.

Most of the comments made by parents about the residence provisions were on the topic of integration with the hearing community. Other comments made by the representative sample of parents interviewed follow.

*Last year my daughter was in the dorm. They look after the kids real well.

*It is a good school. The staff, houseparents, kitchen staff are super. No complaints about the living arrangements. Perhaps one houseparent was a mite lax but by and large I have been pretty satisfied with that end of it. A lot of the time the teachers don't look on the houseparent staff as part of the total picture. The group homes are good things. They can learn a lot. The concept is good.

*John (not his real name) really likes ASD, especially this year, as he is in a house with 6 boys. He is a leader. He looks forward to school. He really enjoys it.

*At ASD my son has supervised homework. In the second half of this year he gets to go to a group home - he anticipates and is excited about this. The houseparents try hard with the kids. We are setting up a foster home, working through the school. We haven't finished these arrangements.

As might be expected, the last three parents quoted lived from 100 to 300 miles away. The four comments given above constitute all the mentions of residences from the fourteen parents interviewed. Most parents of day students volunteered no comment on the residences.

The residence program will be considered again in Part IV FINDINGS and RECOMMENDATIONS so will not be further elaborated here, except to mention the universal approval of the group homes.

4.8 OTHER STAFF

ASD had an extensive and well-qualified instructional support staff as follows.

Speech therapists	4	Audio Visual technician	1
Audiologist	1	Hearing Aid technician	1
Social Worker	1	Media-Library (Part-time)	
Guidance Counselor (part-time)	1	Occupational therapist	1
		Psychologist	1

The psychologist came on staff in February to fill a vacant position. The instructional support staff is reported on in Appendix 2, and will be considered in Part III RESULTS.

Other staff members include those attached to the business office ($5\frac{1}{2}$ including the Bursar), two nurses of the infirmary staff, ten kitchen staff, four Child Care Attendants, a caretaker, four laundry service workers, a head housekeeper (who was also a CCA), and a transportation service worker.

There were also three secretaries in the administrative office. Buildings and Grounds, which was a responsibility of the Department of Public Works, also had several staff members. However, it should be noted that Public Works had other office space at ASD that served as headquarters for the maintenance of several buildings looked after by that Department.

Many compliments were heard about the cleanliness of the building, the quality of the food, and of the fine efficient service provided by these staff members.

4.9 FINANCES

The budget of ASD is listed under four main groupings. The 1982-83 budget figures are shown.

1.	Manpower (salaries, wages, employer contributions tuition, bursaries, sabbaticals, etc.)	$3,272,710.
2.	Supplies and services (books, food, cleaning supplies, etc.)	468,560.
3.	Grants (to EPBS for off-campus vocational program, etc.)	206,500.
4.	Fixed Assets (filing cabinets, vacuum cleaners, etc.)	161,528.
		$4,109,298.

However, buildings and grounds were looked after by Public Works, Supply and Services, which had a separate budget for this, approximating $788,000. for 1982-83.

The Bursar reported to the Superintendent. The Bursar was responsible for budgeting, expenditures, student trust account, a donation account, and revenue (tuition fees, amounting to 15% of cost of maintaining and educating a deaf student, set at $1850.00 for the

full year of 1982-83). He was also responsible for personnel services, staff, and support services. These latter were outlined in the preceding section. Finally, he was responsible for a list of ancillary services such as inventory, school calendar, student awards, communications and insurance.

For the past two years program unit grants (Special Education) have been available to districts which elected to provide education for the deaf. For the first student this grant was $20,770., for the second $24,920. and so on for seven or more, when the grant was $41,520. plus $6920. per student in excess of six. If the district elected to send the student or students to ASD this grant was not paid, and the tuition fee of $1850.00 for the full year was assessed against it. Some of this amount could be covered for some districts by another grant.

The effect of the program unit grants was to permit districts to attempt to provide alternative educational provisions for the deaf.

4.10 LOOKING AHEAD - THE NEXT 25 YEARS

ASD celebrated its 25th anniversary in 1981. At that time, Kelly Boesen, then superintendent, prepared a forward-looking document entitled "The Next 25 Years". It is seldom that one finds the person with overall responsibility for an institution making and recording for public view long range plans. This unusual document is highly commended.

It has 62 pages, with sections on future directions, the historical base, the present program, and summary recommendations. The first section is briefly encapsulated below.

The document affirms that ASD "should continue to exist and to continue providing educational services to deaf children for the next quarter century". The reasons given were as follows:

1. ASD is the only viable means of providing adequate comprehensive educational programming for the rural Alberta deaf student.
2. It has the specialty resources to best meet the individual needs of deaf students.
3. It is the only centre comprehensive and specialized enough to serve as an all-around demonstration and training centre for local programs.

4. It offers parents and local school authorities an option to local programming for their deaf child.
5. It serves as a visible symbol of one type of handicap.

The report then goes on to specify the way that ASD should operate for the next 25 years. It should have the following features or characteristics,

1. "A comprehensive educational centre", including the services of speech therapists, audiologists, learning disability specialists, occupational therapists, psychologists, social workers, guidance counsellors, and probably a host of others".
2. "Child Study/Assessment Centre. Every deaf child in Alberta should have a comprehensive diagnostic/educational assessment leading to an individual plan for his or her education".
3. "Resource/Demonstration/Training Centre". This would not be restricted to the preparation of teachers of the deaf, but could include personnel from many fields.
4. Community/Continuing Education Centre. It was envisioned that the facilities would remain available to many community, school board, and government services. In addition, ASD will remain "a friend and benefactor of the deaf community. ASD should continue to make its resources and facilities available to both 'normal hearing' and deaf community groups during the next quarter century".

This summary provides the main points of Kelly Boesen's look into the future. However, the report available in ASD library, gives a better explanation and rationale for his recommendations.

PART II. PROCEDURES

5.1 OVERVIEW OF PROCEDURES

The terms of reference of the evaluation determined the broad outlines of the procedures to be used. The formative evaluation proposed should identify commendable procedures which should be continued and perhaps strengthened, and should also identify areas where improvement was needed. The principal evaluators sought to secure considerable qualitative evidence through interviews and open-ended items on questionnaires, while at the same time securing relevant quantitative data from both questionnaires and various documentary sources.

The procedures used for gathering data followed those specified in the terms of reference, starting in November 1982 with an assessment of instruction. Twelve Alberta Education consultants, assisted as required by interpreters, visited ASD on various occasions and observed instruction and students, examined materials and plans, and performed the activities in which they were skilled. For eight their assignment was to determine the extent to which the Alberta curriculum was being followed in language arts, social studies, science, mathematics, art, physical education, household economics, and industrial arts. Three were to appraise instructional support services, guidance, media/library and administration. Another Alberta Education consultant made arrangements and assisted in a number of the procedures. This part of the evaluation was completed by March 1982. The consultants typically observed teaching, provided immediate feedback, if numbers of teachers warranted had a group meeting for further feedback, and submitted a written report to the principal evaluators.

Three external specialists, two of whom were specialists in deaf education and one in deafness, spent the week of December 6-10, 1982, assessing instruction from the point of view of deaf education and deafness, assessing the use of instructional support, evaluating the residences, and interviewing senior students. The feedback and written report pattern described for Alberta Education consultants was also followed.

Commencing in October 1982, non-structured interviews were conducted

with 79 parents, teachers, students, members of ASD Advisory Board, administrators, and others. These proved very valuable in providing input to the principal evaluators, particularly for the preparation of questionnaires. The interviews were largely completed by December 1982 and were finally completed by March 1983.

Early in 1983 questionnaires were devised for parents, teachers, houseparents, child care attendants, graduates, and senior students. There was considerable overlap of items in the first five of these. The questionnaire for senior students was different.

These procedures provided for the principal evaluators the expert opinions of twelve Alberta Education consultants in their areas of expertise, of three external specialists in deaf education and deafness, and in addition 7321 views or opinions based on the interviews and questionnaires. Nearly half of these opinions or views were from parents of students in ASD.

5.2 ALBERTA EDUCATION CONSULTANTS

These people were experienced in school evaluations. On many occasions in ordinary schools they had gone through the process of observing instruction in a broad sense, providing feedback to the instructors, and preparing written reports. However, all except two, who were consultants in the education of the hearing impaired, were unfamiliar with deafness and deaf education. Because of this limitation, interpreters were provided as required and the task assigned to the consultants was to determine the extent to which The Alberta Curriculum was being followed. This assignment, if pursued exhaustively, inevitably led to methods and procedures suited to educating the deaf, and what modifications in the Alberta curriculum might be required. It was not intended that the Alberta Education consultants address these matters.

The first school subjects considered by the Alberta Education Consultants were language arts, social studies, mathematics, and science. An Alberta Education consultant who specialized in each spent two days (November 23-24) observing, making oral follow-up reports to each teacher observed, and making an overall report to all the teachers observed. Each consultant observed eleven teachers.

Later, the consultants sent in a written report to the principal evaluators. These were released to ASD for immediate use in improving instruction.

The procedure used for other subjects, instructional support, and media library was modified because fewer persons were involved. The overall report to the group was omitted because in some cases this would have been one person. As before, the written reports were released to ASD for use in improving instruction.

In the case of administration, the Alberta Education consultant spent more time, visited ASD on three occasions, reported orally to officials of ASD, and submitted a written report in March.

5.3 EXTERNAL SPECIALISTS

In general, the procedures used paralleled those used by the Alberta Education consultants. On the first evening, a social gathering served to commence the orientation of the external specialists. Present were the two Alberta Education consultants for the hearing impaired, the chairman of the Steering Committee for the evaluation, and the principal evaluators. The morning of the next day was devoted to an orientation by the administration of ASD. Special prominence and extended time was provided for Kelly Boesen, superintendent (who had resigned to accept a position in South Dakota) to present the strengths and weaknesses of ASD. A lively discussion followed.

For the next two and one-half days the external specialists visited classrooms. Each observed twelve. The procedures followed were like those used by Alberta Education consultants.

On the fourth day each specialist was assigned to a different task. One assessed residence provisions, another instructional support, and the third interviewed senior students, along with principal evaluator Clarke.

On the evening of the fourth day a dinner was hosted by the principal evaluators for all of the administrators of ASD including the teacher seniors, the Alberta Education consultants for education of the hearing impaired, the chairman of ASD Advisory Board, and the two interpreters.

The last day was spent in perception sharing by the external specialists and others, conferring with the administration, and a final report back to the instructional staff.

The written reports of the external specialists are appended as Appendix 1, 2, and 3 of this report.

5.4 INTERVIEWS

The interviews served several purposes. They provided an early orientation for the principal evaluators. An analysis of the contents of certain of the interviews was used in developing, and later in validating, the questionnaires. They also permitted those interviewed to clarify their opinions and feelings about ASD.

The interview schedule included the following:

1.	A random one in ten sample of parents	14
2.	Other parents	1
3.	A random one in four sample of teachers	10
4.	Other teachers	4
5.	Remainder of executive of Parents' Community Council not in (1)	6
6.	Members of ASD Advisory Board not in (1)	9
7.	Administrators (including teacher seniors) in ASD	12
8.	Others (Pastor Bauer, Glenrose Hospital personnel, university professors, government officials, etc.)	14
9.	Senior students at ASD	9
	Total number of interviews	79

The interviews started in October 1982 and most were completed before Christmas 1982. A few of the interviews were conducted with both of the principal evaluators present. A few of the senior student interviews were done by Nyberg. The balance of the interviews were done by Clarke.

The procedure used was non-directive, in the spirit of qualitative evaluation, which tries to avoid forcing the evaluator's frame of reference on the person being interviewed. There were three directives or questions as follows:

1. What is your connection with ASD?
2. Tell me about ASD.
3. What improvements would you suggest for ASD?

If the person being interviewed sought more specific direction, eg. What do you want to know about ASD?, the response was

"Whatever you want to tell about it". The interviewer made a record on $8\frac{1}{2}$ x 11 sheets and as soon as a sheet was full, handed it to the person being interviewed to check the accuracy of the record. Typically records were one to four pages, with most either two or three. Confidentiality was promised.

Content analyses were performed on the results from the random sample of parents, and of teachers. These were used in preparing the questionnaires. Other content analyses were performed as required.

5.5 QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARENTS

This was the first questionnaire constructed. The items were based on the terms of reference of the evaluation, the content analysis of the interview of the representative sample of parents, and suggestions from the Steering Committee. It was decided to try to restrict its size to one page in order to encourage a greater return. It was also decided to use assertions with which parents could disagree or agree in order to express their opinions. A middle "neither agree nor disagree" position was provided, and a "don't know". The disagreement provided two levels "strongly disagree" and "disagree", as did agreement. Appendix 4 lists the items. A long page $8\frac{1}{2}$' x 14', was required for one page to suffice.

A very brief set of data was requested: the living arrangement for the student (in residence or at home) and the student's grade level (Junior, Intermediate or Senior). After this there were two open-ended items, each followed by four to six inches of space in which to respond. The first was "In the space below, please list what you think are good things about the Alberta School for the Deaf". The second was "In the space below, please state how you think the Alberta School for the Deaf should be improved. Attach an extra sheet if more space is needed".

The questionnaires were piloted on five parents. The pilot consisted of one of the principal evaluators sitting with a parent while the questionnaire was completed. As the parent worked, and following completion of the form, the parent was encouraged to express opinions about items which were not clear, ambiguous, or in any way puzzling. As a result of the piloting a number of improvements in wording were

made.

The questionnaires were accompanied by a separate sheet which explained the purpose, illustrated how the disagree-agree items were to be marked, and instructed how to return the questionnaires. They were mailed in a hand addressed envelope which also included a stamped self addressed return envelope. The mailing was made on January 24, 1983 to 62 Edmonton and 71 out of town addresses.

In the second week after January 24 some 79 telephone calls were made to parents in the Edmonton telephone exchange area. Seventy-five were completed. Parents were asked if they had received the questionnaire, had returned it, and if not, if they would. Eighteen long distance calls were made, of which 13 were completed. Principal evaluator Clarke made all of these telephone calls.

As of March 1, 1983, there were 90 returns for a percentage return of 67.6%.

The open-ended responses were classified, and coded for key punching and machine analysis, and each was copied down to be used in illustrating the evaluation report.

5.6 QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

It had been decided to have an overlap of items between this questionnaire and the one for parents. After deciding which items would be common to both, the procedures used to construct the remainder of the questionnaire for teachers followed that outlined in section 5.5. The data requested were different: teaching level, years of experience teaching at ASD, and hearing status. The two open-ended questions were the same. See Appendix 5.

An examination of Appendix 4 and Appendix 5 will show that the following disagree-agree items on the questionnaire for teachers were identical with the corresponding items on that for parents: 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 21, 25, 26, 30, and 32. Items 18 and 19 on the questionnaire for teachers corresponded with item 18 on the questionnaire for parents. Thus, there was an overlap of twelve items.

The questionnaire was piloted on five teachers. It was hand

delivered to the 37 teachers and three teacher seniors on staff. A box, like a ballot-box, was located in the general office of ASD for the return of the questionnaires. By March, there were 34 out of 37 teacher questionnaires returned, or 91.8%. All three of the questionnaires from the teacher seniors were returned.

The open-ended responses were classified and coded for machine analysis, and each was recorded to illustrate the evaluation report.

5.7 QUESTIONNAIRE FOR HOUSEPARENTS AND CHILD CARE ATTENDANTS

The procedures used in preparing these questionnaires paralleled those used for parents and teachers. Of the 25 disagree-agree items, 12 were taken from the questionnaire for teachers, with "houseparent" or "Child Care Attendant" replacing the term "teacher" where appropriate: 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 13, 17, 18, 19, 23 (same as 25), 24, 25 (same as 27). Seven were identical with both teachers' and parents': 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 21. Thus, 19 of the 25 disagree-agree items could not be altered. Hence, a pilot was dispensed with.

The six items unique to this questionnaire, with the number they bore, were as follows:

5. Inservice sessions for houseparents should be compulsory.
10. Inservice sessions for houseparents should be held at a time when they can attend.
15. Houseparents have a responsibility for providing some sex education for students.
16. Student discipline at ASD is excellent.
20. Communication between houseparents of students at the Junior level and ASD teaching staff is excellent.
22. Communication between houseparents of students at the Senior level and ASD teaching staff is excellent.

The two open-ended questions remained the same as those used in the questionnaires for parents and for teachers.

The data requested from houseparents and CCA's was minimal: number of years experience in the position at ASD. The questionnaires were returned in the same ballot-type box used for the questionnaire for teachers. All five of the questionnaires for CCA's were returned, and 14 out of 17 or 82.3% of the questionnaires for housekeepers were returned.

As with the questionnaires described previously the open-ended

responses were classified and copied down for illustration of the evaluation report.

5.8 QUESTIONNAIRE FOR GRADUATES

This questionnaire had 28 items of the disagree-agree type, nearly all taken from the questionnaire for parents: 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25. One, number 27, was taken from the questionnaire for teachers. The items were changed into the past tense, eg. "Students have too much homework" was changed to "Students had too much homework". The following items were unique.

3. I think I got a pretty good education at ASD.
4. Students were not challenged enough when I went to ASD.
16. I think I would have learned more in a regular school.
26. I am very happy with my life now.
27. I think I will be able to train for the job I want.
28. I look forward to the future with confidence.

The two open-ended questions were the same as those shown in Appendix 4 for the Questionnaire for Parents.

The personal information included age, the number of years attendance at ASD, and the date of last attendance. A series of questions designed to discover something about employment did not turn out to be successful.

The questionnaires were administered in two group sessions to 17 graduates who were attending Alberta College. Twelve were recent graduates (1980, 81, or 82) and five graduated earlier. Two instructors who signed administered the questionnaires in regular class periods. One signed each item. The other, with a smaller class, answered questions. Both went over the purpose and instructions as explained by principal evaluator Clarke.

A further attempt was made to contact graduates at the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology, and at Grant McEwan College. Because many of the former had apprenticeship work in the daytime, an evening session was arranged at ASD. Potentially, eighteen might have attended, but in fact three did and completed the questionnaire. As before, an interpreter signed.

The results from these 20 graduates were hand tabulated. The

open-ended responses were skimpy.

The same questionnaire, with appropriate modifications for personal data, was sent to Marshall Wick at Gallaudet College. ASD records showed 12 graduates attending there. Professor Wick was asked to get these together, if possible, and to administer the questionnaire. As it turned out, there were 12 recent graduates and ten less recent. Professor Wick had the questionnaires administered and returned to the principal evaluators.

5.9 QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SENIOR STUDENTS

Part of the assignment for the external specialists was that one, Marshall Wick, would spend a day interviewing senior students at the school. These were randomly selected. Principal evaluator Clarke did the same. He interviewed and took notes from the interviews with nine students. An interpreter was used.

This experience enabled the principal evaluators to determine what kind of questionnaire was appropriate, and what measures were required in its administration. The following questionnaire was developed.

EVALUATION OF THE ALBERTA SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF
STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. HOW OLD ARE YOU? ___ YEARS
2. HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN ATTENDING A.S.D.?
   AS A DAY STUDENT ___ YEARS IN RESIDENCE ___ YEARS
3. HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE A.S.D. (CHECK)
   NOT AT AL ___ A LITTLE ___ QUITE A BIT ___ VERY MUCH ___

4. DO YOU THINK A.S.D. IS A FRIENDLY PLACE?

VERY UNFRIENDLY ___ UNFRIENDLY ___ NEITHER UNFRIENDLY NOR FRIENDLY ___ FRIENDLY ___

VERY FRIENDLY ___

5. IN WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING ARE YOU BEST? (CHECK)

WRITTEN ENGLISH ___ READING ___ SOCIAL STUDIES ___

SCIENCE ___ MATHEMATICS ___

IN WHICH OF THESE DO YOU THINK YOU NEED MOST IMPROVEMENT (MARK 1)

6. HOW WELL CAN YOU COMMUNICATE WITH YOUR PARENTS? (CHECK)

WITH MOTHER VERY WELL ___ WELL ___ SO SO ___ POORLY ___ VERY POORLY ___

WITH FATHER VERY WELL ___ WELL ___ SO SO ___ POORLY ___ VERY POORLY ___

7. IN THE PAST, TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE YOUR PARENTS HELPED YOU WITH YOUR EDUCATION, PARTICULARLY USE OF ENGLISH? (CHECK)

A LOT ___ SOME ___ NOT MUCH ___ NOT AT ALL ___

8. THE THING I LIKE BEST ABOUT A.S.D. IS _____ BECAUSE

Following the last item there was about 3 inches of space for the students to write in their responses.

In administering this questionnaire an overhead projector and an interpreter were used. First principal evaluator Clarke explained the purpose. Then the first item was projected onto the screen and the interpreter signed it, explaining what the student was to do. As it turned out, in item 5 there was a continual need to stress that a choice of only one was requested. Many students wished to choose more than one as their "best subject". When item 8 was projected and explained, there was another transparency projected with lists of many parts or aspects of ASD: a teacher, group living, a school subject, parties, a sport, students union, and the like. The interpreter emphasized that the student could select any part or aspect of ASD. Again, many wanted to choose more than one.

The intention in this last item was to obtain a sample of the student's use of English. These samples were analyzed in a five-point scale from best to worst.

The questionnaire was administered to all students of level 8 or up for a total of 59 who were in attendance on the four occasions when it was administered. Some classes were combined, others could not be. A total of 10 administrations were required, with numbers of students ranging from 3 to 13. The levels (grades or classes) included were 8G, 8M, 8B; 9G, 9M, 9B; 10G1, 10G2; 10B1, 10B2; PV2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 or fifteen classes.

Students ranged in age as follows:

age 13 years - 5	16 years - 11	19 years - 1
14 years - 5	17 years - 17	
15 years - 8	18 years - 12	

Many students had great difficulty in completing item 2, years of attendance. The incomplete, spotty, and probably inaccurate results were the bases for not using data from this item.

5.10 DOCUMENTS AND RECORDS

There were many written sources of information provided by ASD. Much of this required special compilation or a search of files. The staff of ASD were most helpful and cooperative, and on every occasion provided information which was requested if it was available. In this regard we particularly acknowledge the help of Kelly Boesen, Superintendent (up to Dec. 31, 1982); Heleen McLeod, Acting Superintendent, January, 1983; W. Lockhart, Acting Superintendent, Feb. 1, 1983 - Feb. 1, 1984; Walter Panteluk, Bursar; Carl Simonson, Principal; Evelyn Just, Vice-Principal; the three teacher seniors Ruth Crossley, Dave Mason, and Nat Pilling; Joe McLaughlin, guidance; Charmaine Meuse, librarian; and the secretarial staff.

Many of the previous studies listed in section 4.2 were obtained from ASD. The library provided books and magazines. The counsellor provided data from the Alberta Survey of the Hearing Impaired, and a number of research papers. Several teachers submitted articles from journals and magazines. These are only a few of the documents and records which provided background for the evaluation.

Professor Michael Rodda of The University of Alberta was particularly helpful in loaning books, scholarly papers, microfilms, and research reports. These helped to provide an orientation for the principal evaluators.

PART III

RESULTS

6.1 RESULTS FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARENTS

The procedures used in preparing, delivering, and ensuring return of the questionnaire were described in section 5.5. It will be recalled that 133 were mailed out and 90 returned (67.6%). These 90 were analyzed to determine reliability and validity, to secure the results on the disagree-agree type items, and the open-ended items were classified and recorded.

The reliability coefficient (Cronbach's Alpha) on items 1-26 was found to be 0.92. These items were considered suitable for parents to express the degree of favourablity or unfavourability toward ASD. Reliability and validity were further carefully measured against the interview records. The name of each of the 14 parents in the random sample interviewed was on the questionnaire. Twelve of these were returned. Each questionnaire was analyzed by selecting statements from the interview record, and searching for questionnaire items of the same kind. Here is an example. During the interview the parent had stated "ASD is a beautiful school, The teachers are all friendly. They teach the children really good" etc. This parent marked the following questionnaire items as shown.

15. Teachers at ASD are very friendly toward their students. Marked "strongly agree".
22. I think my deaf child (or children) would have learned more in a regular school. Marked "disagree".
26. Generally speaking, ASD is a very good school. Marked "strongly agree".

In practice, many statements from the interview, and many items, were matched.

This procedure revealed that there was a one to one correspondence between interview results and questionnaire items on eleven out of twelve of the returns matched. On the other, the questionnaire results were much more critical of ASD than was the interview. This discrepancy was followed up and two factors were involved. The interview had occurred early in December. After the interview the Mother had visited the school two or three times and was quite dissatisfied

with something that was happening to her child. The questionnaire was completed early in February, after these incidents. Another factor which explained the discrepancy was that the interview had been with the Mother only, and the questionnaire was completed by the Mother and Father working together.

It was concluded that the questionnaires were reliable and valid in the sense that true opinions were being recorded.

It is well known that in regular schools, the support for home and school associations is strong in parents of beginners, and wanes as students progress through the grades. Parents of older students tend to become increasingly critical of the schools, particularly if their child (or children) has not done well. Parents of students at ASD were asked on Part II of the questionnaire to state the level (Junior, Intermediate, Senior) of their deaf child or children. There were 40 who checked Junior (hereinafter called J parents) and 50 who checked Intermediate, Senior, more than one, or failed to check level (one parent). These latter will be called Other (O).

An initial analysis confirmed that the views of the J and O groups differed on many of the disagree-agree type items. For this reason, the results on such items are presented in order, J then O then B (both). However, on 11 items (one-third) the differences, if any, were so small that a separate listing was not warranted. Only B (both) is presented.

Letters representing responses will be used at the beginning and for the first items of each page. These are: SD for strongly disagree, D for disagree, N for neither agree nor disagree, A for agree, SA for strongly agree, DK for don't know, and NU for not usable (omitted, or two choices circled). The first row following N (number) is the tally, and beneath it following % (percent) is the percentage that number is of the total.

The first item reads as follows: No J parents (zero percent) strongly disagreed with the statement. Two O parents (4.0 percent) strongly disagreed, and two B parents (2.2 percent of the total 90 parents) strongly disagreed. Results can be combined along rows. Thus, one J parent (2.5 percent of the 40) either strongly disagreed or disagreed; ten O parents either strongly disagreed or disagreed (20.0 percent of

the 50) and in total, 11 B parents (12.2 percent of the 90) strongly disagreed or disagreed. The rest of the results are read in a similar manner.

1. Students at the Alberta School for the Deaf (ASD) get along well with each other.

		SD	D	N	A	SA	DK	NU
J	N	0	1	6	25	2	5	1
	%	0	2.5	15.0	62.5	5.0	12.5	2.5
O	N	2	8	9	18	6	6	1
	%	4.0	16.0	18.0	36.0	12.0	12.0	2.0
B	N	2	9	15	43	8	11	2
	%	2.2	10.0	16.7	47.8	8.9	12.2	2.2

2. Students have too much homework.

B	N	11	39	15	8	3	12	2
	%	12.2	43.3	16.7	8.9	3.3	13.3	2.2

3. Students at ASD are too isolated from the hearing community.

J	N	3	11	5	12	5	4	0
	%	7.5	27.5	12.5	30.0	12.5	10.0	0
O	N	4	4	10	12	15	4	1
	%	8.0	8.0	20.0	24.0	30.0	8.0	2.0
B	N	7	15	15	24	20	8	1
	%	7.8	16.7	16.7	26.7	22.2	8.9	1.1

4. My deaf child (or children) is too isolated from the hearing community.

J	N	9	18	4	7	2	0	0
	%	22.5	45.0	10.0	17.5	5.0	0	0
O	N	5	18	3	9	11	2	2
	%	10.0	36.0	6.0	18.0	22.0	4.0	4.0
B	N	14	36	7	16	13	2	2
	%	15.6	40.0	7.8	17.8	14.4	2.2	2.2

5 Students learn good study habits at ASD.

J	N	2	4	5	18	2	9	0
	%	5.0	10.0	12.5	45.0	5.0	22.5	0
O	N	9	13	6	12	4	4	2
	%	18.0	26.0	12.0	24.0	8.0	8.0	4.0
B	N	11	17	11	30	6	13	2
	%	12.2	18.9	12.2	33.3	6.7	14.4	2.2

6. Achievement standards in school subjects of students at ASD should be raised.

J	N	1	4	5	11	10	9	0
	%	2.5	10.0	12.2	27.5	25.0	22.5	0
O	N	1	1	5	12	23	8	0
	%	2.0	2.0	10.0	24.0	46.0	16.0	0
B	N	2	5	10	23	33	17	0
	%	2.2	5.6	11.1	25.6	36.7	18.9	0

Parents (continued)

7. Students at ASD should be made to work harder.

		SD	D	N	A	SA	DK	NU
J	N	0	12	13	6	4	4	1
	%	0	30.0	32.5	15.0	10.0	10.0	2.5
O	N	3	7	2	13	15	10	0
	%	6.0	14.0	4.0	26.0	30.0	20.0	0
B	N	3	19	15	19	19	14	1
	%	3.3	21.1	16.7	21.1	21.1	15.6	1.1

8. The academic program (English, Social Studies, Math., and Science) at ASD is excellent.

J	N	4	6	3	12	2	13	0
	%	10.0	15.0	7.5	30.0	5.0	32.5	0
O	N	13	14	4	10	2	7	0
	%	26.0	28.0	8.0	20.0	4.0	14.0	0
B	N	17	20	7	22	4	20	0
	%	18.9	22.2	7.8	24.4	4.4	22.2	0

9. At ASD there should be greater emphasis on language instruction (use of English, reading, grammar, etc.).

J	N	0	1	10	17	8	4	0
	%	0	2.5	25.0	42.5	20.0	10.0	0
O	N	1	4	3	19	21	2	
	%	2.0	8.0	6.0	38.0	42.0	4.0	
B	N	1	5	13	36	29	6	0
	%	1.1	5.6	14.4	40.0	32.2	6.7	0

10. The vocational program (shop, home ec., etc.) at ASD is excellent.

J	N	1	1	4	13	0	21	0
	%	2.5	2.5	10.0	32.5	0	52.5	0
O	N	5	5	7	21	3	8	1
	%	10.0	10.0	14.0	42.0	6.0	16.0	2.0
B	N	6	6	11	34	3	29	1
	%	6.7	6.7	12.2	37.8	3.3	32.2	1.1

11. Parents should have more say in how the school is run.

B	N	5	12	26	23	15	7	2
	%	5.6	13.3	28.9	25.6	16.7	7.8	2.2

12. Parents should have more say in how students are taught.

B	N	6	13	28	23	13	3	4
	%	6.7	14.4	31.1	25.6	14.4	3.3	4.4

13. Students are generally happy at ASD.

J	N	0	1	1	27	7	4	0
	%	0	2.5	2.5	67.5	17.5	10.0	0
O	N	2	2	9	28	3		0
	%	4.0	4.0	18.0	56.0	6.0		0
B	N	2	3	10	55	10	10	0
	%	2.2	3.3	11.1	61.1	11.1	11.1	0

Parents (continued)

14. There is a great need for more parent education.

		SD	D	N	A	SA	DK	NU
B	N	1	3	13	39	29	5	0
	%	1.1	3.3	14.4	43.3	32.2	5.6	0

15. Teachers at ASD are very friendly towards their students.

J	N	1	0	5	25	7	2	0
	%	2.5	0	12.5	62.5	17.5	5.0	0
O	N	1	6	12	19	3	8	1
	%	2.0	12.0	24.0	38.0	6.0	16.0	2.0
B	N	2	6	17	44	10	10	0
	%	2.2	6.7	18.9	48.9	11.1	11.1	1.1

16. Parents of pre-school deaf children are not getting enough help.

J	N	2	8	7	4	5	14	0
	%	5.0	20.0	17.5	10.0	12.5	35.0	0
O	N	0	4	5	6	4	31	0
	%	0	8.0	10.0	12.0	8.0	62.0	0
B	N	2	12	12	10	9	45	0
	%	2.2	13.3	13.3	11.1	10.0	50.0	0

17. Parents "get the runaround" when they talk to ASD staff.

J	N	7	15	4	7	2	5	0
	%	17.5	37.5	10.0	17.5	5.0	12.5	0
O	N	2	12	8	6	19	2	1
	%	4.0	24.0	16.0	12.0	38.0	4.0	2.0
B	N	9	27	12	13	21	7	1
	%	10.0	30.0	13.3	14.4	23.3	7.8	1.1

18. Communication between parents and ASD staff is excellent.

J	N	1	8	8	18	3	2	0
	%	2.5	20.0	20.0	45.0	7.5	5.0	0
O	N	12	12	10	12	1	2	1
	%	24.0	24.0	20.0	24.0	2.0	4.0	2.0
B	N	13	20	18	30	4	4	1
	%	14.4	22.2	20.0	33.3	4.4	4.4	1.1

19. One of the best things about ASD is the residences.

B	N	12	14	16	16	6	23	3
	%	13.3	15.6	17.8	17.8	6.7	25.6	3.3

20. The school discourages parents from trying to help students to learn.

J	N	14	19	2	2	1	2	0
	%	35.0	47.5	5.0	5.0	2.5	5.0	0
O	N	8	17	10	5	4	6	0
	%	16.0	34.0	20.0	10.0	8.0	12.0	0
B	N	22	36	12	7	5	8	0
	%	24.4	40.0	13.3	7.8	5.6	8.9	0

21. Students learn the necessary living skills at ASD.

B	N	7	19	11	36	7	10	0
	%	7.8	21.1	12.2	40.0	7.8	11.1	0

Parents (continued)

22. I think that my deaf child (or children) would have learned more in a regular school.

		SD	D	N	A	SA	DK	NU
J	N	16	16	3	2	2	1	0
	%	40.0	40.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	2.5	0
O	N	14	13	4	8	6	5	0
	%	28.0	26.0	8.0	16.0	12.0	10.0	0
B	N	30	29	7	10	8	6	0
	%	33.3	32.2	7.8	11.1	8.9	6.7	0

23. Teachers, houseparents, and other staff, working together have produced good student discipline.

	N	13	8	10	40	8	11	0
	%	14.4	8.9	11.1	44.4	8.9	12.2	0

24. Report cards say that students are doing better than they actually are.

J	N	1	26	5	1	1	6	0
	%	2.5	65.0	12.5	2.5	2.5	15.0	0
O	N	0	19	7	8	8	8	0
	%	0	38.0	14.0	16.0	16.0	16.0	0
B	N	1	45	12	9	9	14	0
	%	1.1	50.0	13.3	10.0	10.0	15.6	0

25. Living in residence is not a good experience for students.

B	N	10	25	16	12	8	19	0
	%	1.1	27.8	17.8	13.3	8.9	21.1	0

26. Generally speaking, ASD is a very good school.

J	N	2	3	5	20	10	0	0
	%	5.0	7.5	12.5	50.0	25.0	0	0
O	N	6	11	7	15	7	3	1
	%	12.0	22.0	14.0	30.0	14.0	6.0	2.0
B	N	8	14	12	35	17	3	1
	%	8.9	15.6	13.3	38.9	18.9	3.3	1.1

27. I think parents of deaf children should learn to sign

B	N	2	2	5	27	53	0	1
	%	2.2	2.2	5.6	30.0	58.9	0	1.1

28. American Sign Language (ASL) should not be used by the teachers in the classroom.

B	N	16	20	14	13	19	7	1
	%	17.8	22.2	15.6	14.4	21.1	7.8	1.1

29. Some students should be taught using ASL as the language of instruction.

B	N	9	19	17	15	10	17	3
	%	10.0	21.1	18.9	16.7	11.1	18.9	3.3

Parents (continued)

30. Teachers should accept whatever means of communication a child uses, but if ASL is used, the teacher should first restate in signed English, then respond.

		SD	D	N	A	SA	DK	NU
J	N	1	3	3	19	8	4	2
	%	2.5	7.5	7.5	47.5	20.0	10.0	5.0
O	N	4	5	8	21	6	4	2
	%	8.0	10.0	16.0	42.0	12.0	8.0	4.0
B	N	5	8	11	40	14	8	4
	%	5.6	8.9	12.2	44.4	15.6	8.9	4.4

31. Students should not be allowed to use ASL in class.

J	N	10	12	3	7	3	4	1
	%	25.0	30.0	7.5	17.5	7.5	10.0	2.5
O	N	6	11	9	7	9	7	1
	%	12.0	22.0	18.0	14.0	18.0	14.0	2.0
B	N	16	23	12	14		12	2
	%	17.8	25.6	13.3	15.6		13.3	2.2

32. ASL should be used in classroom teaching only if, after several tries using manually coded English (signed English) the student still does not understand something.

J	N	4	8	3	15	3	4	3
	%	10.0	20.0	7.5	37.5	7.5	10.0	7.5
O	N	4	11	9	12	2	10	2
	%	8.0	22.0	18.0	24.0	4.0	20.0	4.0
B	N	8	19	12	27	5	14	5
	%	8.9	21.1	13.3	30.0	5.6	15.6	5.6

33. When my deaf child (or children) attending ASD completes schooling, I think he/she (or they) "can make it" in the learning world.

J	N	5	2	9	9	6	9	0
	%	12.5	5.0	22.5	22.5	15.0	22.5	0
O	N	8	10	2	13	4	12	1
	%	16.0	20.0	4.0	26.0	8.0	24.0	2.0
B	N	13	12	11	22	10	21	1
	%	14.4	13.3	12.2	24.4	11.1	23.3	1.1

Focusing first on all parents, the B group, we can note that comparisons between items are possible. For example, item 3 shows that 48.9 percent of parents were agreed that students are too isolated from the hearing community, but in item 4, only 32.2 percent thought that their own child was. The reader is invited to explore the differences in views of the J and O groups.

Some items reveal pronounced views in one direction. Most pronounced is #27 (parents should learn to sign) with 88.9 percent agreement, followed by 14 (need for parent education) with 75.5 percent agreement, then 9 (greater emphasis on language instruction) and 13 (students are generally happy) tied at 72.3 percent agreement. In contrast, other

statements show very divided opinion, particularly those dealing with ASL. On item 28, the disagreement was 35.5 percent and the agreement 40.0 percent, with 15.6 percent neither agreeing nor disagreeing, and 7.8 percent "don't know". On the next item, use of ASL as the language of instruction, the percentages were: disagreement 31.1, neither agree nor disagree 18.9, agreement 37.8, don't know 18.9, and didn't do the item (or spoiled it) 3.3. There are more examples of divided opinion, particularly items 11 and 12 (more parental say) and 19 (residences). Some items generate a large "don't know" response, understandably so, as in item 10 (vocational program excellent), item 16 (parents of preschool children not enough help), 25 (living in residence), and #33 ("make it" in the hearing world). If the student had not been in the vocational program, the only basis of parent knowledge is hearsay.

Turning now to the two groups of parents J (those with students in the Junior Department) and O (other), we note that there are almost no differences on some items. These are #2 (students have too much homework), numbers 11 and 12 (parents should have more say in how the school is run, or how students are taught), #14 (there is a great need for parent education), #19 (one of the best things about ASD is the residences), #21 (students learn the necessary living skills at ASD, #23 (good student discipline), #25 (residence living a good experience), #27 (parents should learn to sign) and numbers 28 and 29 on signing. Thus, on 11 out of 33, or one-third of the items, the differences between the two groups are minor.

However, on two-thirds of the items, there are differences large enough to warrant separate treatment. On item 26, (ASD is a very good school) the agreement expressed by the J group was 75 percent, and by the O group 44 percent. The J group was more favourably disposed to ASD. This same sentiment, often not as strongly marked, was apparent in items 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, and 24. It is clear that parents of students in the Junior Department were, in general, more favourably disposed toward ASD than were other parents.

The demographic data asked for in Part II produced the following results in response to the question "Where does your deaf student (or students) live?" At home 65 (72.2%). In the off-campus living

program 5 (5.6%). In residence on-campus 19 (21.1%). In foster homes 0. No response 1 (1.1%).

Another question was "At what level is your deaf student?" The responses were as follows:

Junior 40 (44.4%)	Intermediate 21 (23.3%)
Senior 25 (27.8%)	More than one 3 (3.3%)
No response 1 (1.1%)	

By referring back to section 4.5, one can calculate that the percentage of students in the Junior department as of January, 1983, was just about 40%. Of parents who answered the questionnaire 44% listed their deaf student as being in the Junior department. It is evident that these parents were slightly more frequent responders.

There is some indirect evidence (postmarks) which suggest that the return from out of town parents was lower than that for parents with an Edmonton address.

Part II had two open-ended items. Every response made by a parent was classified and copied down to be used in illustrating points made in the evaluation. The first item was "In the space below, please list what you think are good things about the Alberta School for the Deaf". The classification, with numbers of statements so classified, follows.

Code	Classification	N
1	Generally speaking, ASD is a good school.	23
2	Teachers, teaching, houseparents, other staff, are good.	14
3	Deaf children can be comfortable, and communicate with peers and deaf adults.	12
4	There are some outstanding, excellent teachers.	11
5	Buildings, facilities, equipment, etc. are good.	11
6	The presence of deaf teachers is a good feature.	8
7	The sports program is a good feature.	7
8	Dorm life, residences, group homes are good.	6
9	Use of total communication is a good feature.	5
10	ASD must be retained. It is a good school for the deaf.	4
11	Other (widely varied mentions)	27
	Total	128

An example for each classification will be given to illustrate the kind of statement parents wrote in. For the classes with larger numbers two or three examples will be given.

1. *I believe ASD is great.

*I am glad a school like ASD is available to educate my child.

2. The teachers are definitely involved and committed to their students' progress.
3. Interaction with other deaf children and deaf adults is very positive.
4. Some of the teachers are excellent - they have good skills and are there to do a job.
5. ASD has beautiful grounds, clean and spacious buildings, good meals.
6. (A good thing about ASD is) use of deaf teachers in the school. They have a better understanding of deaf children.
7. ASD has a good sports program.
8. Dorm life teaches them fairly good independence and life style.
9. The total communication concept at ASD (is a good thing).
10. The deaf school is necessary. It is the only way to teach children with hearing impairment.
11. *The discipline at the school has been fine as far as we know.
    *A centralized education program for rural children (is a good thing about ASD).
    *Allows for a community and educational center for the deaf.

The second open-ended item on Part II requested suggestions for improvement. "In the space below, please state how you think the Alberta School for the Deaf should be improved. Attach an extra sheet if more space is needed". The classification, with numbers of statements so classified, follows.

Code	Classification	N
1	ASD needs better teachers, better teaching.	16
2	Students need to be integrated into the hearing world.	15
3	The level of school achievement needs to be improved.	14
4	The administration needs to be improved.	12
5	Houseparents, dormitory staff need improvement.	11
6	There is need for more and/or better communication.	11
7	More, and/or improved speech therapy.	9
8	ASD needs to have, and to follow a curriculum.	7
9	Get rid of incompetent teachers.	6
10	Use of English needs improving.	5
11	Other (widely varied mentions).	60
	Total	166

An example for each classification will be given to illustrate the kind of statement parents wrote in. For classes with larger numbers of statements more than one example will be given.

1. *I think teachers should be upgraded.
   *I think the school teachers should make sure the student understands what they are doing. Too many times they don't understand what is expected of them.
2. I feel deaf children should be integrated with hearing children.

3. The academic program needs improvement.
4. Administration should be taking a leading role not a reactive role.
5. The houseparents especially in the intermediate and senior dorms have very little control over the students.
6. We need staff to develop skills in communicating with parents on a positive level - the reverse is true if possible.
7. Maybe as the grades progress more voice as well as sign.
8. A curriculum should be developed and adopted for ASD.
9. Deadwood and duds in the staff should be relieved.
10. Teach the students the best possible system of use of English whether they are signing to their peers, talking, or writing a note to their boss.
11. *Each child should have a case conference with all the people involved attending.
*A music program should be considered; students abilities and interests are underestimated.
*More homework.
*Salaries should be adjusted to assure the highest standards of professionals available in North America. This would be the greatest asset to the education of the deaf possible.
*Our child has had a lot of homework so I wouldn't like to see him get any more.
*Don't use sign language at school. Teach the proper English.

The results from the questionnaire for parents included responses to 33 disagree-agree statements, demographic data, and responses to two open-ended items. All of the latter responses were classified and recorded for use in illustrating various matters.

6.2 RESULTS FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

Section 5.5 describes the procedures used in preparing, delivering, and collecting this questionnaire. Those completed by the three teacher seniors were not included in the results given below. Out of 37 possible, 34 questionnaires were returned. As with the questionnaire for parents, these were analyzed to determine reliability and validity. Preliminary analyses of results were made to determine whether there were differences among groups in the disagree-agree type items. The write-ins from the open-ended items were classified and recorded.

The Cronbach reliability coefficient for items 1 - 26 was .85. These items were considered to be those on which a generally favourable or unfavourable opinion about ASD could be expressed. As with the questionnaire for parents, the interview record of teachers in

the random sample was used to assess reliability and validity. Eight out of ten of these were available. The matching procedure described in section 6.1 resulted in a one to one correspondence between the interview results and the questionnaires on all eight returns. It was concluded that the questionnaire was reliable and valid.

The analyses of the disagree-agree type items showed differences on some items between the views of teachers in the Junior Department and other teachers, and between deaf or hard of hearing teachers and hearing teachers. Where these differences were of sufficient magnitude to warrant, results will be presented separately with J used to signify those from teachers in the Junior Department, O for other teachers, D for deaf or hard of hearing teachers, and H for hearing. A will be used to signify all 34 teacher respondents.

As before, the symbol SD stands for strongly disagree, D for disagree, N for neither agree nor disagree, A for agree, SA for strongly agree, DK for don't know, and NU for not usable (omitted, or two responses circled). Also as before, the row following N (number) is the tally, and that following % (percent) is the percentage that number is of the total. The first item reads as follows. Three out of 12 teachers in the Junior Department (25.0 percent) strongly disagreed. Ten out of 22 other teachers (45.5 percent), strongly disagreed. Thirteen out of all 34 teachers (38.2 percent) strongly disagreed. The rest of the results read in the same way.

1. Communication between teachers and administrators (superintendent, principal, and vice-principal) is excellent.

		SD	D	N	A	SA	DK	NU
J	N	3	4	3	1	1	0	0
	%	25.0	33.3	25.0	8.3	8.3	0	0
O	N	10	9	1	1	1	0	0
	%	45.5	40.9	4.5	4.5	4.5	0	0
A	N	13	13	4	2	2	0	0
	%	38.2	38.2	11.8	5.9	5.9	0	0

2. There is need for several more usable inservice sessions each year.

J	N	1	3	1	4	3	0	0
	%	8.3	25.0	8.3	33.3	25.0	0	0
O	N	0	2	5	12	3	0	0
	%	0	9.1	22.7	54.5	13.6	0	0
A	N	1	5	6	16	6	0	0
	%	2.9	14.7	17.6	47.1	17.6	0	0

Teachers (continued)

3. There is not enough help and direction for teachers by administrators.

		SD	D	N	A	SA	DK	NU
J	N	0	2	3	1	5	1	0
	%	0	16.7	25.0	8.3	4.7	8.3	0
O	N	0	0	4	10	8	0	0
	%	0	0	18.2	45.5	36.4	0	0
A	N	0	2	7	11	13	1	0
	%	0	5.9	20.6	32.4	38.2	2.9	0

4. Morale of teachers at ASD is high.

J	N	1	6	2	2	1	0	0
	%	8.3	50.0	16.7	16.7	8.3	0	0
O	N	10	9	2	1	0	0	0
	%	45.5	40.9	9.1	4.5	0	0	0
A	N	11	15	4	3	1	0	0
	%	32.4	44.1	11.8	8.8	2.9	0	0

5. Communication among teachers in different departments is excellent.

J	N	1	5	2	4	0	0	0
	%	8.3	41.7	16.7	33.3	0	0	0
O	N	5	10	3	3	0	0	1
	%	22.7	45.5	13.6	13.6	0	0	4.5
D	N	1	5	3	3	0	0	0
	%	8.3	41.7	25.0	25.0	0	0	0
H	N	5	10	2	4	0	0	1
	%	22.7	45.5	9.1	18.2	0	0	4.5
A	N	6	15	5	7	0	0	1
	%	17.6	44.1	14.7	20.6	0	0	2.9

6. Achievement standards in school subjects of students at ASD should be raised.

A	N	0	3	9	15	4	2	1
	%	0	8.8	26.5	44.1	11.8	5.9	2.9

7. Students at ASD should be made to work harder.

A	N	1	6	8	10	9	0	0
	%	2.9	17.6	23.5	29.4	26.5	0	0

8. Teachers at ASD receive excellent support from administrators.

J	N	6	3	2	0	1	0	0
	%	50.0	25.0	16.7	0	8.3	0	0
O	N	9	11	0	1	1	0	0
	%	40.9	50.0	0	4.5	4.5	0	0
A	N	15	14	2	1	2	0	0
	%	44.1	41.2	5.9	2.9	5.9	0	0

9. At ASD there should be greater emphasis on language instruction (use of English, reading, grammar, etc.).

D	N	0	3	1	7	1	0	0
	%	0	25.0	8.3	58.3	8.3	0	0
H	N	0	5	7	6	4	0	0
	%	0	22.7	31.8	27.3	18.2	0	0
A	N	0	8	8	13	5	0	0
	%	0	23.5	23.5	38.2	14.7	0	0

Teachers (continued)

10. Instructional support services at ASD are excellent

		SD	D	N	A	SA	DK	NU
J	N	0	2	4	3	2	0	1
	%	0	16.7	33.3	25.0	16.7	0	8.3
O	N	3	5	5	7	1	0	1
	%	16.6	22.7	22.7	31.8	4.5	0	4.5
D	N	0	0	5	5	1	0	1
	%	0	0	41.7	41.7	8.3	0	8.3
H	N	3	7	4	5	2	0	1
	%	13.6	31.8	18.2	22.7	9.1	0	4.5
A	N	3	7	9	10	3	0	2
	%	8.8	20.6	26.5	29.4	8.8	0	5.9

11. Parents should have more say in how the school is run.

A	N	23	8	3	0	0	0	0
	%	67.6	23.5	8.8	0	0	0	0

12. Parents should have more say in how students are taught.

A	N	24	7	1	2	0	0	0
	%	70.6	20.6	2.9	5.9	0	0	0

13. Duties of teachers, teacher seniors, and senior administrators are clearly defined.

J	N	1	5	3	1	1	1	0
	%	8.3	41.7	25.0	8.3	8.3	8.3	0
O	N	8	9	3	1	1	0	0
	%	36.4	40.9	13.6	4.5	4.5	0	0
D	N	2	4	2	2	1	1	0
	%	16.7	33.3	16.7	16.7	8.3	8.3	0
H	N	7	10	4	0	1		
	%	31.8	45.5	18.2	0	4.5		
A	N	9	14	6	2	2	1	0
	%	26.5	41.2	17.6	5.9	5.9	2.9	0

14. There is a great need for more parent education.

A	N	0	0	0	7	27	0	0
	%	0	0	0	20.6	79.4	0	0

15. There is a lack of articulation in programs across levels.

D	N	0	1	4	6	0	1	0
	%	0	83	33.3	50.0	0	8.3	0
H	N	2	1	2	9	7	1	0
	%	9.1	4.5	9.1	40.9	31.8	4.5	0
A	N	2	2	6	15	7	2	0
	%	5.9	5.9	17.6	44.1	20.6	5.9	0

16. There is lack of consistency in programs from one year to the next.

D	N	0	2	3	5	2	0	0
	%	0	16.7	25.0	41.7	16.7	0	0
H	N	0	2	2	10	8	0	0
	%	0	9.1	9.1	45.5	36.4	0	0
A	N	0	4	5	15	10	0	0
	%	0	11.8	14.7	44.1	29.4	0	0

Teachers (continued)

17. Teachers have ample opportunity to participate in decision making.

		SD	D	B	A	SA	DK	NU
D	N	4	1	3	4	0	0	0
	%	33.3	8.3	25.0	33.3	0	0	0
H	N	8	9	0	2	2	1	0
	%	36.4	40.9	0	9.1	9.1	4.5	0
A	N	12	10	3	6	2	1	0
	%	35.3	29.4	8.8	17.6	5.9	2.9	0

18. Communication between parents of students at the Junior level and ASD staff is excellent.

J	N	0	1	1	8	2	0	0
	%	0	8.3	8.3	66.7	16.7	0	0
O	N	0	0	2	2	0	17	1
	%	0	0	9.1	9.1	0	77.3	4.5
A	N	0	1	3	10	2	17	1
	%	0	2.9	8.8	29.4	5.9	50.0	2.9

19. Communication between parents of senior students and ASD staff is excellent.

J	N	0	2	2	2	0	6	0
	%	0	16.7	16.7	16.7	0	50.0	0
O	N	1	6	9	4	0	2	0
	%	4.5	27.3	40.9	18.2	0	9.1	0
A	N	1	8	11	6	0	8	0
	%	2.5	23.5	32.4	17.6	0	23.5	0

20. The teaching staff at ASD needs a good professional association.

A	N	0	2	6	11	12	3	0
	%	0	5.9	17.6	32.4	35.3	8.8	0

21. Students learn the necessary living skills at ASD.

J	N	0	1	3	4	3	1	0
	%	0	8.3	25.0	33.3	25.0	8.3	0
O	N	1	3	5	13	0	0	0
	%	4.5	13.6	22.7	59.1	0	0	0
A	N	1	4	8	17	3	1	0
	%	2.9	11.8	23.5	50.0	8.8	2.9	0

22. The relations between deaf teachers and hearing teachers at ASD are excellent.

J	N	0	2	4	4	1	1	0
	%	0	16.7	33.3	33.7	8.3	8.3	0
O	N	0	3	4	7	8	0	0
	%	0	13.6	18.2	31.8	36.4	0	0
D	N	0	1	2	4	5	0	0
	%	0	8.3	16.7	33.3	41.7	0	0
H	N	0	4	6	7	4	1	0
	%	0	18.2	27.3	31.8	18.2	4.5	0
A	N	0	5	8	11	9	1	0
	%	0	14.7	23.5	32.4	26.5	2.9	0

Teachers (continued)

23. Teaching and administrative staff should spend more time planning for, and organizing instruction.

		SD	D	N	A	SA	DK	NU
A	N	0	3	6	18	7	0	0
	%	0	8.8	17.6	52.9	20.6	0	0

24. Rules and procedures for discipline are well coordinated as between teachers and houseparents.

J	N	0	5	3	3	0	1	0
	%	0	41.7	25.0	25.0	0	8.3	0
O	N	10	8	4	0	0	0	0
	%	45.5	36.4	18.2	0	0	0	0
A	N	10	13	7	3	0	1	0
	%	29.4	38.2	20.6	8.8	0	2.9	0

25. Living in residence is not a good experience for students.

A	N	11	8	5	6	3	1	0
	%	32.4	23.5	14.7	17.6	8.8	2.9	0

26. Generally speaking, ASD is a very good school.

D	N	0	0	0	5	7	0	0
	%	0	0	0	41.7	58.3	0	0
H	N	1	1	4	10	6	0	0
	%	4.5	4.5	18.2	45.5	27.3	0	0
A	N	1	1	4	15	13	0	0
	%	2.9	2.9	11.8	44.1	38.2	0	0

27. Houseparents and teachers understand and agree on what should be done to help students develop language.

J	N	1	3	3	1	1	3	0
	%	8.3	25.0	25.0	8.3	8.3	25.0	0
O	N	3	8	5	0	0	6	0
	%	13.6	36.4	22.7	0	0	27.3	0
D	N	1	2	5	0	0	4	0
	%	8.3	16.7	41.7	0	0	33.3	0
H	N	3	9	3	1	1	5	0
	%	13.6	40.9	13.6	4.5	4.5	22.7	0
A	N	4	11	8	1	1	9	0
	%	11.8	32.4	23.5	2.9	2.9	26.5	0

28. As a teacher, I understand the goals of teaching profoundly deaf students.

A	N	0	0	2	11	19	1	0
	%	0	0	5.9	32.4	55.9	2.9	0

29. I clearly understand how my teaching contributes to the goals of teaching profoundly deaf students.

A	N	0	0	3	11	20	0	0
	%	0	0	8.8	32.4	58.8	0	0

30. Teachers should accept whatever means of communication a child uses, but if ASL is used, the teacher should first restate in signed English, then respond.

		SD	D	N	A	SA	DK	NU
A	N	2	2	9	11	8	1	1
	%	5.9	5.9	26.5	32.4	23.5	2.9	2.9

31. The Alberta Program of Studies cannot be used in ASD without considerable modification.

D	N	0	1	2	4	5	0	0
	%	0	8.3	16.7	33.3	41.7	0	0
H	N	1	2	1	7	11	0	0
	%	4.5	9.1	4.5	31.8	50.0	0	0
A	N	1	3	3	11	16	0	0
	%	2.9	8.8	8.8	32.4	47.1	0	0

32. ASL should be used in classroom teaching only if, after several tries using manually coded English (signed English), the student still does not understand something.

D	N	1	1	0	4	6	0	0
	%	8.3	8.3	0	33.3	50.0	0	0
H	N	0	4	3	11	4	0	0
	%	0	18.2	13.6	50.0	18.2	0	0
A	N	1	5	3	15	10	0	0
	%	2.9	14.7	8.8	44.1	29.4	0	0

Considering first the views of all 34 teachers (marked A) several highlights can be noted. In general, teachers felt that administration needed strengthening (items 1, 3, 8, 13, 17, 23). They strongly rejected the idea of more parent input. Normally, the views of any group spread over the spectrum, but on item 12 (Parents should have more say in how the students are taught) there was 91.2 percent disagreement. Even more pronounced were their views on the need for parent education as measured by item 14, where 100 percent were in agreement. Teachers perceived disjointedness in the curriculum as shown in items 15 and 16. Two thirds (item 20) expressed the need for a good professional association. A majority agreed in item 22 that relations between deaf teachers and hearing teachers were excellent. One might assume that a larger proportion would have rated them "good". They perceived the need, in items 24 and 27, for better coordination of effort as between teachers and houseparents. In the overall evaluation of ASD, item 26, there were 82.3 percent in agreement that ASD is a very good school. Items 28 and 29 showed the vast majority were comfortable about the goals of their teaching. A surprising proportion, 26.5 percent, neither agreed nor disagreed with

the position on the use of ASL set forth in item 30. However, there was strong agreement (73.5 percent) with the position on its use stated in item 32. Finally, 73.5 percent expressed the need for considerable modification in using the Alberta Program of Studies.

Turning to the groups within the teaching force, it was noted that on five items there was a difference between J and O, and between D and H: #5 (teacher communication among departments), #10 (instructional support excellent), #13 (duties clearly defined), #22 (relations between deaf and hearing teachers excellent), and #27 (houseparents and teachers re language). In addition to these, deaf and hearing teachers differed on #9 (emphasis on language), #15 (articulation across levels), #16 (consistency from year to year), #17 (participation in decision making), #26 (ASD is a good school), #31 (need for modification of the Alberta Program of Studies) and #32 (use of ASL). A careful examination of these differences reveals that deaf and hearing teachers did not hold opposite views, but that hearing teachers tended to be more critical of features of ASD. Teachers in the Junior Department differed from other teachers on fourteen items, five of which were items on which deaf and hearing teachers also differed. The remaining nine items were #1 (Communication between teachers and administrators) which J's rated bad but O's rated worse, #2 (need for inservice) which J's didn't support as such as did the O's, #3 (help and direction by administrators) which the O's felt more lacking than did the J's, #4 (morale) which O's rated worse, #8 (teacher support from administrators) which O's rated worse, #18 (communication between parents and teachers at the Junior level) which O's rightly rated "don't know", #19 (same at senior level) which O's rated worse than did J's, #21 (students learn living skills) where none of the O's strongly agreed, and #24 (disciplined rules, teachers and houseparents) where O's were much more critical.

The differences between the Junior Department and other teachers are similar to those between deaf and hearing teachers. They do not take opposite positions, but the "other" teachers tend to be more critical of features of ASD.

Part II commenced with a few questions about level of teaching, years of experience and hearing. Of the 34 respondents, 12 were teaching

at the Junior level, 8 at the Intermediate, 12 at the Senior level, and 2 (Physical Education teachers) at more than one level.

Years of experience of the 34 teachers were as follows.

1 or 2 years	8	8, 9, 10 years	6
3 or 4 years	6	11, 12, 13, 14 years	3
5, 6, 7 years	6	15 or more years	5

The hearing status of the respondents were as follows.

Deaf	7	Hearing	19
Hearing impaired	5	No response	3

Comparisons with the data on teachers given in section 4.6 reveal that all of the teachers at the Junior level responded to the questionnaire. One teacher with 3 or 4 years of experience did not respond, one with 8 or 9 or 10 years did not, and one other with more than 10 years experience did not.

Part II had two open-ended items. The first was "In the space below, please list what you think are good things about the Alberta School for the Deaf". The results were classified and copied down for use in illustrating points. The classification was as follows.

Code	Classification	N
1.	Teachers care, are dedicated, are capable, are good teachers.	27
2.	The use of total communication is a good feature.	9
3.	Deaf staff members communicate well with students and are good role models.	8
4.	The atmosphere of ASD is friendly.	7
5.	Residence staff are capable, concerned, good.	7
6.	Buildings, facilities, materials are good.	5
7.	There is a low student-teacher ratio.	5
8.	There is good instructional support.	4
9.	Other (widely varied mentions),	50
	Total	122

An example for each classification, with additional examples for classifications with larger numbers, follows.

1. *The teachers are generally very dedicated.
   *Creative teachers willing to adapt the program for individual children.
   *Teachers who devote extra hours to parent counselling and home visits.
2. The students at ASD are highly skilled communicators, able to communicate in signs with fluidity and flexibility, to express their meanings and emotions clearly to a variety of people. Many people in the school are highly skilled at understanding what the students say.
3. Students at ASD have excellent role models - which is not the case in other schools I have visited.

4. The atmosphere in our wing is very conducive to good work for both adults and children.
5. We have some excellent houseparents, caretakers, cooks, etc.
6. ASD is certainly one of the best equipped schools in Canada. The facilities are excellent.
7. There is a good ratio of students to teachers.
8. I think our support staff knows their work and works well with the rest of the staff. There is a lot of communication between the support staff and teachers.
9. *(ASD has) a good principal who is innovative and positive.
*Quite a good number of our students attend Gallaudet College.
*We have a very good librarian.
*The half-time program gives deaf students the opportunity to mingle with hearing people.
*The credit system currently being established at ASD should improve standards and bring about greater consistency in programming.

The second open-ended item on Part II asked for suggestions for improvements. "In the space below, please state how you think the Alberta School for the Deaf should be improved. Attach an extra sheet if more space is needed". The classification, with numbers of statements so classified, follows.

Code	Classification	N
1.	Administration needs improving.	21
2.	There should be advance planning, with follow through to avoid "crisis management".	9
3.	Parents should not be allowed to interfere with the operation of the school.	6
4.	There should be better communication, all staff including administration.	6
5.	There should be more teacher input into planning and decisions.	3
6.	Other (widely varied mentions)	47
	Total	92

An example for each classification is given below, with additional examples for classifications with large numbers.

1. *We need a good strong administration. Teachers need support. Parents should not run ASD.
*The administration at ASD is our weakest link. There is little organization and there is lack of communication with staff. There is a feeling of non-trust in the administration.
*ASD should be improved in the area of organization and coordination.
2. We need to have follow through on things which are decided.
3. Parents have a hand which weighs too heavy. The administration is often too concerned about the parents to stick up for the teachers. The parent-school relationship restricts the teachers' willingness to try new approaches and leaves teachers with a feeling of insecurity.

4. Better inter-staff communication is needed, within teaching groups, teacher-houseparent, teacher administrator.
5. It would be nice if the teachers had some small measure of input into educational decisions - after all, the parents do.
6. *ASD should be run by a public school board.
*A more consistent approach to the kind of signing system we adopt based on current research. Classes need to be provided at ASD during the afternoons or lunch hours. Not all staff can attend the programs at A.C. or Millwoods.
*The presence of a powerful ruling union which has in the past forced administration to withdraw simple decisions related to school undertakings - lesson plans. It is "sick" that professionals run to the union for petty little issues and to avoid responsibilities.
*In the dorm. lounge there should be books, dictionaries, and other reading material.
*Staff should become members of the ATA.

6.3 RESULTS FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR HOUSEPARENTS and CHILD CARE ATTENDANTS

It was explained in section 5.7 that 19 of the 25 items of the "disagree-agree" type were taken from either the questionnaire for parents, or that for teachers. The number of houseparents was 17, of whom 14 completed the questionnaire. The number of child care attendants was 5, all of whom completed the questionnaire. Because so many of the items were taken from the other questionnaires, and because even when combined the number of respondents (19) was small, no attempt was made to pilot the questionnaire nor to determine reliability and validity.

There was, for the number of persons involved, a high number of "Don't know" responses. This suggests reliability and validity, since it could be expected as a response on a number of items.

Because a careful inspection revealed no pattern of difference in response between the two groups, results were combined. The abbreviations HP's will be used for houseparents, and CCA's for child care attendants.

In the following listing of responses, SD stands for strongly disagree, D for disagree, N for neither agree nor disagree, A for agree, SA for strongly agree, DK for don't know and NU for non usable - omitted, or because two responses were circled. These letters will be used at the beginning and for the first item of each page. The first row of figures following N (number) is the tally, and beneath it following

% (percent) is the percentage that number is of the total. The first item reads as follows: 4 out of 19 or 21.1 percent responded "Strongly Disagree". Seven out of 19 or 36.8 percent responded "Disagree", and so. Results can be combined. Thus 11 out of 19 or 50% did not agree with item 1.

1. Communication between HP's (or CCA's) and administrators (superintendent, principal, vice-principal) at ASD is excellent.

	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK	NU
N	4	7	4	2	1	1	0
%	21.1	36.8	21.1	10.5	5.3	5.3	0

2. There is a need for several more usable inservice sessions each year.

N	0	4	3	10	1	1	0
%	0	21.1	15.8	52.6	5.3	5.3	0

3. There is not enough help and direction for HP's (or CCA's) by the administration and the acting Dean of Residence.

N	0	5	5	4	4	1	0
%	0	26.3	26.3	21.1	21.1	5.3	0

4. Morale of HP's (or CCA's) at ASD is high.

N	1	6	4	3	3	2	0
%	5.3	31.6	21.1	15.8	15.8	10.5	0

5. Inservice sessions for HP's (or CCA's) should be compulsory.

N	1	3	3	12	0	0	0
%	5.3	15.8	15.8	63.2	0	0	0

6. Achievement standards in school subjects of students at ASD should be raised.

N	0	1	1	7	7	3	0
%	0	5.3	5.3	36.8	36.8	15.8	0

7. Students at ASD should be made to work harder.

N	0	1	3	7	8	0	0
%	0	5.3	15.8	36.8	42.1	0	0

8. HP's (or CCA's) at ASD receive excellent support from administrators and the Acting Dean of Residence.

N	3	7	4	3	1	0	1
%	15.8	36.8	21.1	15.8	5.3	0	5.3

9. At ASD there should be greater emphasis on language instruction (use of English, reading, grammar, etc.).

N	0	0	2	9	8	0	0
%	0	0	10.5	47.4	42.1	0	0

10. Inservice sessions for HP's (or CCA's) should be held at a time when they can attend.

N	0	1	2	8	8	0	0
%	0	5.3	10.5	42.1	42.1	0	0

HP's and CCA's (continued)

11. Parents should have more say in how the school is run.

	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK	NU
N	3	8	3	0	2	2	1
%	15.8	42.1	15.8	0	10.5	10.5	5.3

12. Parents should have more say in how the students are taught.

N	3	8	5	0	1	2	0
%	15.8	42.1	26.3	0	5.3	10.5	0

13. Duties of HP's (or CCA's), teachers, teacher seniors and senior administrators are clearly defined.

N	0	7	2	7	0	2	1
%	0	36.8	10.5	36.8	0	10.5	5.3

14. There is a great need for more parent education.

N	0	1	0	7	9	2	0
%	0	5.3	0	36.8	47.4	10.5	0

15. HP's (or CCA's) have a responsibility for providing some sex education for students.

N	0	3	4	9	0	3	0
%	0	15.8	21.1	47.4	0	15.8	0

16. Student discipline at ASD is excellent.

N	13	5	0	0	0	1	0
%	68.4	26.3	0	0	0	5.3	0

17. HP's (or CCA's) have ample opportunity to participate in decision making.

N	5	8	3	1	1	1	0
%	26.3	42.1	15.8	5.3	5.3	5.3	0

18. Communication between parents of students at the Junior level and ASD staff is excellent.

N	0	4	4	4	0	6	1
%	0	21.1	21.1	21.1	0	31.6	5.3

19. Communication between parents of senior students and ASD staff is excellent.

N	0	5	5	4	1	4	0
%	0	26.3	26.3	21.1	5.3	21.1	0

20. Communication between HP's (or CCA's) of students at the Junior level and ASD teaching staff is excellent.

N	0	4	3	5	2	5	0
%	0	21.1	15.8	26.3	10.5	26.3	0

21. Students learn the necessary living skills at ASD.

N	1	4	5	5	2	2	0
%	5.3	21.1	26.3	26.3	10.5	10.5	0

22. Communication between HP's (or CCA's) of students at the Senior level and ASD staff is excellent.

N	0	1	6	7	2	3	0
%	0	5.3	31.6	36.8	10.5	15.8	0

HP's and CCA's (continued)

23. Living in residence is not a good experience for students.

	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK	NU
N	3	7	2	2	3	2	0
%	15.8	36.8	10.5	10.5	15.8	10.5	0

24. Rules and procedures for discipline are well coordinated as between teachers and HP's (or CCA's).

N	4	8	2	4	1	0	0
%	21.1	42.1	10.5	21.1	5.3	0	0

25. HP's (or CCA's) and teachers understand and agree on what should be done to help students develop language.

N	1	6	6	2	1	3
%	5.3	31.6	31.6	10.5	5.3	15.8

Items 3 and 8 were imperfect, containing two referents toward which there was very different reaction. Some HP's and CCA's explained that in item 3, for example, they agreed that "There is not enough help and direction for HP's (or CCA's) by the administration", but disagreed that "There is not enough help and direction for HP's (or CCA's) by the Acting Dean of Residence". The results for these two items were not usable.

One of the most pronounced results is on item 16 (student discipline is excellent), where the disagreement was 94.7 percent. On item 9 (need for emphasis on language instruction) agreement was 89.5 percent, and on 14 (need for parent education) 84.2 percent. There was divided opinion on morale (item 4), clarity of duties (item 13), and communication (items 18, 19, and 20). As with the teacher group, there was general disagreement with parents having more say. On both items 11 and 12 it was 57.9 percent.

There was support in item 2 for inservice sessions (57.9 percent). In item 5 there was stronger support (63.2 percent) that they be compulsory, and in item 10 that they be held at convenient times (84.2 percent). There was strong support (73.6 percent) for raising achievement standards (item 6), and even stronger (78.9 percent) for making students work harder (item 7). This group did not think they had ample opportunity to participate in decision making (item 17, 68.4 percent), nor did they think (item 24) that rules and procedures re discipline were well coordinated with teachers (63.2 percent).

The personal data requested on this questionnaire was simply the number of years experience as a HP or CCA. The distribution of

years of experience as a houseparent at ASD was as follows:

2 years experience	1	16 years experience	1
4 years experience	2	23 years experience	1
6 years experience	1	25 years experience	1
9 years experience	2	Space left blank	3
12 years experience	2	Total	14

The distribution of years of experience as a child care attendant at ASD was as follows:

1 years experience	1	8 years experience	1
2 years experience	2	Space left blank	1
		Total	5

The first open-ended item was "In the space below, list what you think are the good things about ASD". Six houseparents and 4 child care attendants did not respond. The nine responses were too few to classify, so a few are quoted as examples.

> HP ASD is a great place for the deaf children to socialize; otherwise they would find it more difficult to do in a public school. Good understanding of deafness problems.
> HP Equipment like decoders, TTY's, etc. The curriculum of the school is much better.
> HP The deaf students feel comfortable with their peers.
> HP Children are entertained, fed and well looked after by houseparents who love and care for them.
> HP ASD has a hard working, well meaning teaching and support staff who really care for the students they work with.
> CCA I think some of the staff try very hard to take care of the children.

The second open-ended item was "In the space below please state how you think ASD should be improved. Attach an extra sheet if more space is needed." Two attached an extra sheet. Six houseparents and 3 child care attendants did not respond. A few examples of the responses which were made follow.

> CCA More strict discipline and physical punishment such as slap hands or buttocks. Give the kids more homework.
> CCA More communication among staff. Honest opinions. involvement with each other.
> HP Discipline must be improved.
> HP Administration should be improved to be more assertive - not wishy washy. Better public relations with parents.
> HP For an improvement parents should refrain from having too much say in running the educational field.
> HP Lack of consequence when disciplining students - they are warned and warned and nothing happens. Discipline is too soft. Students are rarely made to take responsibility for their actions. ASL should be banned. Students need to learn <u>English</u>.
> HP The students need to be taken out of the extreme isolation of the school and into the community where they belong. Speech

should be given a very high priority. The students, even the very young, have little respect for persons who do not use sign language. They will not use speech voluntarily when communicating if their deaf peers can see them.

There were two themes about which a number of responses were made: discipline and isolation.

6.4 RESULTS FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR GRADUATES

As explained in section 5.8, there were several local sources of graduates. Seventeen at Alberta College and three at the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology participated. In terms of recency of graduation, twelve, all at Alberta College, were very recent graduates as follows.

Graduated from ASD in 1982 - 7
Graduated from ASD in 1981 - 4
Graduated from ASD in 1980 - 1

The remaining eight had graduated at earlier times, as follows: In 1977-1, 1976-1, 1975-0, 1974-1, 1973-1, 1972-1, 1970-0, 1969-0, 1968-2, 1967-0, 1966-1. The latter group attended ASD when it was strongly oral in emphasis, while the more recent graduates had experienced total communication.

A careful examination of the results revealed that on most items of the questionnaire the responses of the two groups were similar. For these items, overall results are presented. For a few items, the results differed, or it might be expected that they would differ and they did not. For these items results are presented separately.

In the listing below, SD stands for strongly disagree, D for disagree, N for neither agree nor disagree, A for agree, SA for strongly agree, DK for don't know, and NU for not usable-omitted or because two responses were circled. These letters will be used at the beginning and for the first item of each page. The first row of figures following N (number) is the tally, and beneath it following % (percent) is the percentage that number is of the total. Item 1 is read as follows: no student strongly disagreed with the statement, seven out of the 20 or 35% disagreed, nine out of the 20 or 45 percent neither agreed nor disagreed, and so on.

Graduates (local)

1. Students at the Alberta School for the Deaf (ASD) got along well with each other.

	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK	NU
N	0	7	9	2	2	0	0
%	0	35	45	10	10	0	0

2. Students at ASD had too much homework.

N	3	1	4	10	0	1	1
%	15	5	20	50	0	5	5

3. I think I got a pretty good education at ASD.

N	0	6	8	2	2	1	1
%	0	30	40	10	10	5	5

4. Students were not challenged when I went to ASD.

N	2	5	8	2	1	2	0
%	10	25	40	10	5	10	0

5. Teachers, houseparents, and other staff, working together produced good student discipline.

N	1	4	7	3	4	0	1
%	5	20	35	15	20	0	5

6. Achievement standards of school subjects of students at ASD should have been higher.

N	0	3	5	5	6	1	0
%	0	15	25	25	30	5	0

7. Students at ASD should have been made to work harder.

N	1	3	0	5	10	1	0
%	5	15	0	25	50	5	0

8. The academic program (English, Social Studies, Math., and Science) at ASD was excellent.

N	1	6	10	1	2	0	0
%	5	30	50	5	10	0	0

9. At ASD there should have been greater emphasis on language instruction (use of English, reading, grammar, etc.).

N	2	1	3	7	7	0	0
%	10	5	15	35	35	0	0

10. The vocational program (shop, home ec., etc.) at ASD was excellent.

N	3	2	4	7	3	1	0
%	15	10	20	35	15	5	0

11. Parents should have had more say in how the school was run.

N	0	3	4	5	8	0	0
%	0	15	20	25	40	0	0

12. Parents should have had more say in how students were taught.

N	0	2	5	10	2	1	0
%	0	10	25	50	10	5	0

Graduates local (continued)

13. Students were generally happy at ASD.

	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK	NU
N	0	6	6	1	1	4	2
%	0	30	30	5	5	20	10

14. There was a great need for more parent education.

N	2	1	3	6	4	4	0
%	10	5	15	30	20	20	0

15. Teachers at ASD were very friendly toward their students.

N	1	4	8	3	0	1	1
%	5	20	40	15	0	5	5

16. I think I would have learned more in a regular school.

N	1	0	2	7	4	5	1
%	5	0	10	35	20	25	5

17. Report cards said that students were doing better than they actually were.

N	3	2	7	6	1	1	0
%	15	10	35	30	5	5	0

18. Houseparents and teachers understood and agreed on what should be done to help students develop language.

N	1	4	5	6	4	0	0
%	5	20	25	30	20	0	0

19. Living in residence was not a good experience for students.

N	6	2	1	4	4	1	2
%	30	10	5	20	20	5	10

20. Generally speaking, ASD is a very good school.

Recent graduates, N = 12

N	0	5	3	3	0	1	0
%	0	41.7	25.0	25.0	0	8.3	0

Less recent graduates, N = 8

N	0	2	2	2	1	1	0
%	0	25	25	25	12.5	12.5	

21. Students learned the necessary living skills at ASD.

N	1	3	10	2	3	1	0
%	5	15	50	10	15	5	0

22. American Sign Language (ASL) should not be used by teachers at ASD in the classroom.

Recent graduates, N = 12

N	4	0	3	0	3	2	0
%	33.3	0	25.0	0	25.0	16.7	0

Less recent graduates, N = 8

N	4	0	0	1	1	1	1
%	50.0	0	0	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5

Graduates local (continued)

23. Some students should be taught using ASL as the language of instruction.

	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK	NU
Recent graduates, N = 12							
N	0	1	1	2	7	1	0
%	0	8.3	8.3	16.7	58.5	8.3	0
Less recent graduates N = 8							
N	1	1	3	1	1	1	0
%	12.5	12.5	37.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	

24. Students at ASD should not be allowed to use ASL in class.

N	8	7	3	1	0	0	1
%	40	35	15	5	0	0	5

25. I think I "can make it" in the hearing world.

N	5	2	3	3	4	2	1
%	25	10	15	15	20	10	5

26. I am very happy with my life now.

Recent graduates, N = 12							
N	0	1	1	5	4	0	1
%	0	8.3	8.3	41.7	33.3	0	8.3
Less recent graduates N = 8							
N	1	2	1	1	3	0	0
%	12.5	25.0	12.5	12.5	37.5	0	0

27. I think I will be able to train for the job I want.

N	0	0	1	8	11	0	0
%	0	0	5	40	55	0	0

28. I look forward to the future with confidence.

Recent graduates, N = 12							
N	0	0	1	7	3	1	0
%	0	0	8.3	58.5	25.0	8.3	0
Less recent graduates, N - 8							
N	1	0	1	2	4	0	0
%	12.5	0	12.5	25.0	50.0	0	0

Attention is drawn to a number of these results. Items 1, 13, and 15 in general tapped compatability, student with student, student with teachers, and resulting happiness. These graduates, in most part, neither agreed nor disagreed with the three statements, but insofar as an opinion was expressed, the weight was towards a negative view.

Looking at items 2 (too much homework) and 7 (students should have been made to work harder), the responses agreed that there was too much homework, but even more strongly agreed that students should have been made to work harder. These views appear to be inconsistent.

On the matter of standards, items 6, 8, 9, and 10 again show mixed, but not necessarily inconsistent views. Just over half of the

graduates agreed that achievement standards in school subjects should have been higher, but exactly half neither agreed nor disagreed that the academic program was excellent. The clearest results were the 70 percent who agreed that there should have been a greater emphasis on language instruction. Half rated the vocational program as excellent.

Items 11 and 12 show that graduates think like parents, in favouring more parental input. Item 16 shows that a majority (55 percent) think they would have learned more in a regular school. The overall evaluation in item 20 shows disagreement with the statement that ASD is an excellent school. Of the 20 graduates, 7 disagree (35%) and 5 agree (25%).

The use of ASL by teachers in class was a matter of strongly divided opinion. Combining the results on item 22, eight graduates out of 20 or 40% strongly disagreed that ASL should not be used, one or 5% agreed, and 4 or 20% strongly agreed. Again combining, 40% disagreed that ASL should not be used by teachers in the classroom and 25% agreed. However, on the next item, 3 agreed and 8 strongly agreed (11 out of 20 or 55%) that some students should be taught using ASL as the language of instruction. On item 24, that students should not be allowed to use ASL in class there was considerable unanimity: 15 out of 20 or 75% disagreed.

The last four items were designed especially for graduates, to get at their life view. Item 25, "I think I can make it in the hearing world" produced an even spread across the alternatives - what is called a rectangular distribution. Graduates were truly divided. But they were very happy with their life now: 13 out of 20 or 65 percent so indicated. Very nearly all (19 out of 20 or 95 percent) thought they would be able to train for the job they wanted. It should be observed that the ones who could be contacted were in the process of upgrading to do exactly that. Finally, 16 out of 20 or 80 percent looked forward to the future with confidence.

On the whole, these graduates were critical of ASD. As can be seen from the descriptions and records of responses on Part II, these students had not achieved well academically at ASD.

Part II of the questionnaire for graduates asked about work

experience. This part caused considerable difficulty. Some had no work experience. Of the eight less recent graduates three completed this part. A summary of each student's response follows.

A graduate age 33 last attended ASD in 1966, had worked for 9 years as a hair stylist at a rate of pay (most recent) of $150.00 per week, plus 55% commission. She would like to get a job as a rehabilitation counsellor.

A graduate age 24 last attended ASD in 1972. He had had 5 different jobs since leaving ASD, the most recent doing drafting for Jack the Stripper at $10.00 an hour. He would like to become a cabinet maker.

A graduate age 27 last attended ASD in 1968, had 3 different jobs, the most recent being a welder for key rental at a rate of pay of $11.00 per hour. He would like to become a welder by attending NAIT and realizes it would involve four years of apprenticeship.

With respect to recent graduates, again all of the listed work experience is summarized below.

A graduate age 19 (who said he had attended ASD for 17 years) last attended ASD in December 1982 had worked for seven months as a janitor at $5.10 an hour. He would like to get a job in construction and was preparing for three years at NAIT.

A graduate age 18 who attended ASD for 7 years, last attendance in June 1982, had worked for two months for Alberta transportation at $6.00 per hour helping file papers. However, he did not state what kind of job he would like to get, nor any further information.

A graduate, age 17, who had attended ASD for 10 years, last attendance being June 1982 had worked at three different jobs, the last being counting newspapers for the Edmonton Journal at $8.00 per hour. He would like to get a job in astronomy or physics by attending Gallaudet College.

A graduate, age 18, who attended ASD for 13 years, until June 1982, had one secretarial job at $4.00 per hour. She would like to train as a clerk-typist, knows she would need more training, and states that this could be obtained at college.

A graduate age 22 years who attended ASD for 10 years, last attended June 1980, had worked for one and one-half years on a tag engraving machine at a most recent rate of pay of $6.98 per hour. He would like to get a job on an engraving machine but did not complete any more of the questionnaire.

A graduate age 20 who attended ASD for 7 years last attended June 1981 had two different jobs, the last being for Husky Oil Co., as a welder and "accountant for bill" at $9.50 per hour. He would like to get a job in biological sciences and expected that five years at Gallaudet would prepare him.

A graduate age 19 who attended ASD for 6 years, last attended in June 1982, had a summer job as a clerk II at $5.50 per hour. She would like to become a computer operator and expected to train for this at Alberta College.

A graduate age 19 who last attended ASD in June 1981 had had 3 different jobs, the most recent being inspecting welding at $7.50 per hour. He would like to become a welder and looks forward to a five year stint at NAIT.

The other four recent graduates listed no work experience. These results are incomplete. Some graduates indicated summer employment, others did not. In the case of the less recent graduates, discussion with the interpreter indicated one worked in a restaurant and another had just completed a course as a meat cutter. Many experienced considerable difficulty in completing Part II, probably because they did not understand what was being asked.

Part III on the questionnaire for graduates asked two open-ended questions. The first was "When you look back to your time at ASD, what were the good things about the school?" Graduates were reluctant to respond because they felt inadequate in English usage. Through the interpreter they were encouraged to try. All of the responses from the less recent graduates follow, with extracts only from one or two long responses.

*I was entered this school in November 1956 and I quite learned in a good thing what teacher had taught but quite sevred that the school would want the students to do a good manner.--- The teacher are quite very good, but I knew they are very patient with the students. As for the houseparents they seem that they didn't encouraged my problem to understand to the Boys, but they did a good discipline.

*Some of the teachers I like them very much they help, but other don't care about what's happening to you.

*When I was a very good in sports. But I didn't have it in academics. So I was little a good in subjects.

*There were a lot of encouragement and support from teachers for one to attend Gallaudet. We had a lot of homework, emphasize on reading and language.

*ASD should improve in future. if I find a new job but I stuck with the empyee because I don't know my what I grade. It need emphasize for English also other subject.

*I like in Edmonton. I am like in school. The teacher is very school.

All of the responses of the more recent graduates are given below, with extracts only from a few lengthy ones.

*Some good not bad. I need education something but because teach give homework easy for me I want more grade up but teach say can't give me grade up.
*Good thing is learning education there, got good enough friend. also club, very good.
*When I really enjoy joined different club and also sport. I learned lots about clubs and sports at all.
*When looking back to my old days, I remembered that there were good things I had been experienced or challenged. Those good things were sports playing outside every day, developing more friendships, and more activities such as organizations.
*I like to education math English. I was learning to Education Pre Voc
*Some things were good, most things were bad because of these education and disciplines. Most students were confessed on their educating levels (not grades), and there have no credits.
*ASD went going to the enter first time class. So was good class student and staff. Well good was classroom for student and staff. But need more for class Language as Math. Staff were the classroom.
*It is good at dorm 1979 and 1981 and good straight of rules.
*The houseparent were a good to help the student about rude in the dorm make them improved
*I was student at ASD in 1973 to 81. I was good student in 1974 to 76. I didn't happy school, because most teacher were lazy, not good show things for education. Houseparents were too mean to them. They always suggest more rules in the dorm. So I'm not happy.
*I learned a lot of English and Reading in 3 years ago. Most I interested in vocational education a lot to make me a good hobby.
*Since I attended ASD in 1968. I got a good academic of junior department. The teachers was teaching english and That my old time, I have a lot ambitions to students and They are also to.--- I was thinking Vocational Program in Gallaudet College because some teachers told me so I made misunderstand.

The second open-ended item in Part III of the questionnaire for graduates was "What things about the Alberta School for the Deaf should be improved?" All of the responses of the less recent graduates follow, with excerpts only from the longer ones.

*I think it needs more education not show silly dirty shows on theatre. More I rather is more education and for teacher to stay in class not leave and allowed students to fool around. also get better teachers for students-----
*I need to train for a job. When if I go to NAIT in the future. I don't satisfied my grade.
*Should set up a grading system, e.g. soph. junior, senior and grade 1-12.
*I think that ASD need more general subject. My reason if Student did not learn any subject then Student want to go to NAIT but They don't know about subject
*I notice that ASD should be change improved in English, Math.

*Most students ignore homework.
*I think that they should be more something better. But at right now I think it's much better than I was in the school.

The following quotations and excerpts are from the more recent graduates.

*ASD need more improve of subject and also need good teachers to teach the students------The teachers should teach them harder.
*No because some staff bad influnce to people and student not like to staff because more rules give puish to people
*ASD should be improved by getting more language grammer and math also living skill. ASD should be improved by teachers discipline more to the students, more strict.
*When I was a student, I remembered that school often planned to improve new things, but it always failed or never improved every year.
*I learn more English
*there must set up new education 1-12 grades and credits as fair as another hearing schools. Students all should learn how good behaviors.
*Well not good for staff. They are staff but need encoraged it important classroom student time. Staff were work as time classroom.
*I want to see more people deaf. They are few. I want to be good food they are lousy same way and should good special of thing food-----
*I want to see at school is a good that should to need more education-----
*OK. They should more tough education, good social living, and less rules. If they give more rules to them some students will be trouble on staff. They should give test them before student will graduation. They want know that student are weak education or strong education.
*The staff should improved to control to students also house-parents. There were no credits for my education. The students education should improved more as hearing school
*I suggest that ASD have more english, orazionation, credits for school limit. The students must have to good times and knowledge about behaving but don't be strict and laughing to make up at deaf students as mute also set up fantasy.

The results for graduates who attended Gallaudet College will be presented adopting the procedure used for those who did not. There were recent graduates as follows.

Graduated from ASD in 1982	-	4
Graduated from ASD in 1981	-	2
Graduated from ASD in 1980	-	0
Graduated from ASD in 1979	-	5
Graduated from ASD in 1978	-	0
Graduated from ASD in 1977	-	2
Total		13

There were also less recent graduates.

Graduated from ASD in 1970	-	1
Graduated from ASD in 1969	-	2
Graduated from ASD in 1968	-	0
Graduated from ASD in 1967	-	1
Graduated from ASD in 1964	-	1
Graduated from ASD in 1960	-	1
Total		6

Where the results on questionnaire items are similar, they will be presented together. For items where results differ, and for the last three items, results are presented separately. Symbols are the same as those used in presenting the results from other graduates.

Results from the Questionnaire for Graduates
Who Attended Gallaudet College

1. Students at the Alberta School for the Deaf (ASD) got along well with each other.

	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK	NU
N	0	2	6	8	3	0	0
%	0	10.5	31.6	42.1	15.8	0	0

2. Students at ASD had too much homework.

N	4	5	8	2	0	0	0
%	21.1	26.3	42.1	10.5	0	0	0

3. I think I got a pretty good education at ASD.

N	0	6	7	6	0	0	0
%	0	31.6	36.8	31.6	0	0	0

4. Students were not challenged enough when I went to ASD.

Recent graduates, N=13

N	0	2	1	7	3	0	0
%	0	15.4	7.7	53.9	23.1	0	0

Less recent graduates, N=6

N	0	3	0	2	1	0	0
%	0	50.0	0	33.3	16.7	0	0

5. Teachers, houseparents, and other staff, working together, produced good student discipline.

N	1	5	5	5	3	0	0
%	5.3	26.3	26.3	26.3	15.8	0	0

6 Achievement standards of school subjects of students at ASD should have been higher.

N	0	1	7	5	5	1	0
%	0	5.3	53.9	26.3	26.3	5.3	0

7. Students at ASD should have been made to work harder.

N	0	0	2	3	14	0	0
%	0	0	10.53	15.8	73.7	0	0

Graduates, Gallaudet (continued)

8. The academic program (English, Social Studies, Math., and Science) at ASD was excellent.

	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK	NU
N	2	8	4	4	1	0	0
%	10.5	42.1	21.1	21.1	5.3	0	0

9. At ASD there should have been greater emphasis on language instruction (use of English, reading, grammar, etc.).

N	1	1	1	4	12	0	0
%	5.3	5.3	5.3	21.1	63.2	0	0

10. The vocational program (shop, home ec., etc.) at ASD was excellent.

N	1	3	6	7	0	1	1
%	5.3	15.8	31.6	36.8	0	5.3	5.3

11 Parents should have had more say in how the school was run.

N	0	0	7	6	5	1	0
%	0	0	36.8	31.6	26.3	5.3	0

12. Parents should have had more say in how the students were taught.

N	0	0	3	8	7	1	0
%	0	0	15.8	42.1	36.8	5.3	0

13. Students were generally happy at ASD.

N	1	7	7	3	1	0	0
%	5.3	36.8	36.8	15.8	5.3	0	0

14. There was a great need for more parent education.

N	0	0	4	6	5	4	0
%	0	0	21.1	31.6	26.3	21.1	0

15. Teachers at ASD were very friendly toward their students.

N	0	3	10	5	1	0	0
%	0	15.8	52.6	26.3	5.3	0	0

16. I think I would have learned more in a regular school.

Recent graduates N=13

N	0	3	4	2	4	0	0
%	0	23.1	30.8	15.4	30.8	0	0

Less recent graduates N=6

N	0	0	0	3	2	1	0
%	0	0	0	50.0	33.3	16.7	0

17. Report cards said that students were doing better than they actually were.

N	0	4	5	7	2	1	0
%	0	21.1	26.3	36.8	10.5	5.3	0

18. Houseparents and teachers understood and agreed on what should be done to help students develop language.

N	0	3	4	7	3	1	1
%	0	15.8	21.1	36.8	15.8	5.3	5.3

(These areas are by no means meant to be exhaustive but rather should be viewed as guidelines.)

3. more orientation be provided to teachers, parents, houseparents and students regarding support service programs in the school.
4. more inservice be provided to support service personnel as to their function in an educational setting and more specifically as to the ways and means of fulfilling this function, i.e., making them an integral part, and not a separate entity, of the educational program.
5. a support services handbook be developed and that it incorporate procedures on the above mentioned areas.

8.12 ASSESSMENT AND MONITORING

The external specialists, parents, and teachers all expressed the need for a very careful assessment and for periodic reassessment. Consistent with democracy and the views put forward in section 7.7, insofar as possible the parents should be involved in the initial stages to present their wishes, and again later so that they could understand and hopefully accept the educational assessment. There is also need to collect in a systematic manner evidence of student progress: work samples, standardized test results, speech (perhaps recorded on tape) and the like. The evidence of student progress is especially important in the language arts, and in very sequential subjects such as mathematics. The Individualized Educational Program resulting from the assessment, and the evidence of progress, would then serve as individual standards, which should inform and motivate students. These records would also keep teachers informed of the progress (or lack of it) of each student, and would form the basis for the most productive of contacts with parents.

The work samples could also form the basis for rough norms. Samples representing "average" achievement could be extracted, preferably for each of the G, B, and M groups. The payoff would be ASD's own standards, which could inform teachers and parents, and motivate students. One very important function of such rough internal norms would be to be able to detect shifts in norms or standards as intake policies changed or alternative programs became available and were used by students.

The principal evaluators make the following recommendation, and also refer the reader to Anderson's recommendations 5.3.5 and 5.3.6 (Appendix 1), and Ryan's recommendations 5, 6, and 7 for the Intermediate Department (Appendix 2).

9. That assessment and monitoring of student potential and progress be continued and strengthened.
   - 9.1 That every effort be made to involve parents before the assessment or reassessment commences.
   - 9.2 That several weeks during the summer break be used for some of the assessments and reassessments.
   - 9.3 That a team of instructional support personnel and teachers be involved in the joint assessment and discussion, including in the early stages, parents if possible.
   - 9.4 That every effort be made to discern parental wishes about speech and speech training, audition, signing and other matters related to communication (See section 6.6, problem area #3 identified by Boesen).
   - 9.5 That a portable and usable record of the assessment, if possible easily reproduceable, be made so that teachers and other instructional staff could have one for each student they instruct.
   - 9.6 That a monitoring system be discussed, considered, and adopted for students at each level, including with the date of origin;
     - 9.6.1 samples of writing (English usage).
     - 9.6.2 samples of speech.
     - 9.6.3 results from teacher made tests in the basic subjects.
     - 9.6.4 standardized test results.
     - 9.6.5 other data deemed of use in monitoring student progress.
   - 9.7 That the monitoring data be as available to teachers as the assessment data and be attached to it.
   - 9.8 That the principal discuss with parents on a regular basis the progress of these children as shown.

8.13 GENERAL

It is the view of the principal evaluators that the major findings and recommendations of section 7, and the specific findings and recommendations outlined in section 8 constitute an overall program for improvement of ASD. To do all that is recommended must appear a formidable assignment, and it is recognized that what is provided points directions but does not prescribe a timetable. However, many of the recommendations do not involve all staff in equal participation, and some refer mainly to some members of staff only. The momentum for change and improvement commenced

before the evaluation started, and hopefully will continue.

There remain a number of general matters which affect the instructional program. One of these, mentioned by administrators, teachers, and others is that the A.U.P.E., the union which represents the instructional staff, is not closely tied to the teaching profession. The Alberta Education consultants mentioned ATA Specialist Councils as valuable professional groups. A number of teachers stated that teacher salaries at ASD were $4,000. to $6,000. lower than for corresponding positions (experience and qualifications) in the districts which surround ASD. The Correspondence School Branch of Alberta Education has professional staff members who belong to A.U.P.E. and almost all are also associate members of the ATA. They prize membership in the appropriate specialist councils. Salaries are generally comparable with those of teachers in surrounding districts. The report by Wick under the heading "Qualifications and Professional Development" (See Appendix 3) makes reference to this matter. It is recommended as follows.

10. That the desirability, feasibility and acceptability of the instructional staff becoming associated members of the ATA, with their own local, be considered by the teaching staff.

Turning to another matter, which is linked to the preceding, teachers need more opportunity for professional development. We have already mentioned such sessions in signing. But teachers need inservice education in curriculum, evaluation, special programs for the deaf, research findings, and programs for parents, to name only a few. Help, to some extent, may be available from the ATA specialist councils in special education, and in guidance. We recommend the following.

11. That professional development of staff continue to be a high priority at ASD.
    - 11.1 That staff preferences among alternate programs be ascertained.
    - 11.2 That expertise within the staff of ASD be used as much as possible in inservice education.
    - 11.3 That the methods used in adult education be accepted as the model for inservice sessions.
    - 11.4 That follow-up on the matters considered be planned and provided.

From many sides the principal evaluators received the message that ASL is used extensively by the deaf. For senior students, this should be recognized and respected. It is possible, even likely, that ASL as used by students at ASD is like English as used by students in hearing schools: replete with slang and improper usage. If this is the case, students should have an opportunity to improve. In addition, it is likely the case that technical and precise usage is a higher level of ASL, just as it is in English. It is recommended as follows.

12. That ASL be recognized as a major means of communication by the deaf, and that students at ASD be provided with an opportunity to improve and refine its use, by optional or extra curricular courses offered by ASD.

9. LOOKING AHEAD

The old order changeth, yielding place to the new;
and God fulfils himself in many ways,
Lest one good custom should corrupt the world.

- Tennyson

9.1 INTRODUCTION

Some claim that the future is unknown and unknowable. While this view may be scientifically and technically correct, if it is adopted for organizations they tend to drift in a rudderless fashion. There is an urgent need for all organizations to have plans, a direction, goals. These goals are most practical if they are middle range, perhaps in the order of the next ten years. Too short a range leads to "fine tuning" or tinkering, and too long a range is hazardous because it is increasingly difficult to see ahead (except that in the long range we will all be dead).

The Worth commission on education in Alberta was entitled "A Choice of Futures." The spirit implied in that title is one which the principal evaluators espouse. In the consideration of possible directions for ASD, instead of presenting one and only one, a number will be examined. While the most likely eventualities will be presented, it is recognized that circumstances can cause the most carefully made forecasts to be wrong. The cautious then hide behind the view that "the future is unknown and unknowable". Our preference is to risk being wrong in order to plan ahead.

Looking ahead for ASD is based on a number of important and carefully documented forecasts of needs, facilities, and feasibility. Those which we could obtain will be cited in the presentation following. As the different possible future trends are outlined, pros and cons will be given, to assist the reader in thinking about the possibilities.

9.2 NEEDS

A generalist's view of the area of handicapping conditions is a good place to start thinking about the one on which ASD focuses: deafness. Briggs (page 46) quotes officials of the Children's Rehabilitation Centre in Saskatoon as follows.

> --- of all children, approximately 2% have significant handicaps and of those, half have severe handicaps. Approximately 1/3 of the 2% have physical handicaps and it is primarily this group of children that are cared for at the centre.

In 1979-80 Briggs studied 20 centres for physically handicapped children in Canada (9), U.S.A. (3), England (6), and Sweden (2). In a chapter on changing points of view and future directions, he quotes the head of one of the Swedish centres as follows (page 44)

> Dr. Olow's suggestion as to the secondary role of a central treatment centre suggests two increasingly important functions of a centre: (1) the establishment of an active assessment unit and (2) the organization of a vigorious outreach service.

A concern voiced by many of the heads of treatment centres was the need for patient living accommodation.

While we have focused on physical handicaps, there are pressing, and in the view of some, even more pressing needs in the areas of emotional disturbance.

We now turn to Brigg's description of an Alberta facility, the Glenrose School Hospital.

> A clinic for cerebral palsy children was opened in the 1950's and later children with other disabilities were served in a local convalescent-rehabilitation provincial hospital. Both these services were eventually combined in the School Hospital, an extensive modern building opened in 1966.
>
> Ten different professions are represented by unusually large departments caring for around 300 children in regular day programs plus approximately as many in out-patient and review clinic services.
>
> The professional staff of over 170 allows opportunities

for much specialization. Medical consultants in specialist fields are used in addition to resident staff. Sophisticated laboratory facilities are available in prosthetics, radiology, speech and audiology, audiovisual and education.

Educable, physically handicapped children are eligible for admission from pre-school to age eighteen. Children with marked speech and language difficulties, regardless of other disabilities, may be admitted. The centre is somewhat unique in offering treatment, also, to seriously emotionally disturbed children. The latter, few of whom are physically disabled, are treated for the most part in a separate unit. Pre-school programs are operated for the physically handicapped, hard of hearing, communication-behavior disorders and "infants at risk." Most children are day-patients but residence facilities are available for those with serious disabilities and for the emotionally disturbed.

The implications of the presentations made so far are postponed until further considerations are put forward. The first has to do with population base, and is quoted from Briggs (page 43).

Investigations in Sweden suggest that it requires a minimum population of around 1.3 million to justify a regional treatment centre (for the physically handicapped) in terms of the potential need.

We turn now to a paper presented by Professor Michael Rodda, University of Alberta, entitled "An analysis of the Myth that Mainstreaming and Integration are Synonymous." He quotes Elizabeth Anderson The Disabled School Child, London: Methuen, 1973, on the main functions of special schools.

1. They should be used increasingly as observational and assessment centres.
2. They should provide children (from as early an age as possible) with an initial period of skilled and intensive training by teachers and therapists working together --- After this period, which might for some children last from one to four years, many children would be ready for transfer to a special or ordinary class.
3. Act as advisory centres from which --- experienced teachers and therapists could go to special and ordinary classes to help teachers.

The cascade system of special education as shown in the diagram differentiates between hospital provision, hospital school, and special residential school. ASD is, of course, a special residential school.

Again, without commenting on the quotations and the diagram further, another report is quoted, this time the report of the team evaluating the learning centre at ASD, dated June, 1979. See section 4.2 #5. Recommendation 2 of this report by Brill, Kennedy and McNeil is as follows.

> There is undoubtedly a considerable number of deaf children in the province of Alberta who have additional handicapping conditions which will probably preclude them ever being enrolled in a program with typical deaf children. Therefore there is need for a program to truly serve various types of deaf multi-handicapped children who are above the trainable level and who require an educational program which will include survival skills, certain limited communication skills and certain relatively simple vocational or pre-vocational skills. It should be anticipated that such children will remain in a unit for multi-handicapped deaf children until they reach the age of leaving school without ever being likely to integrate with typical deaf children. However, such children as adults can be prepared for certain lines of employment in sheltered workshop type of situations. Some may only be able to contribute to their eventual living unit, but with the skills acquired may be able to avoid lifelong institutionalization as adults.

The recommendation goes on to suggest the use of staff residences for classrooms or learning areas, the need for a very special teacher, and the need to develop a curriculum. In the next recommendation, reasons are given why any provincial plan for the sensori-multi-handicapped should include a residential facility for some children.

> ---- There are a number of good reasons why such a residential facility should be a unit as part of the Alberta School for the Deaf housed on its campus. Among the reasons are included the fact that the staff for such a unit should have the opportunity to transfer to the staff of the regular school for the deaf after a period of time working with multi-handicapped deaf children. There are many kinds of services including special media services



Figure 1.
The Cascade System of Special Education
(Modified from Deno, 1968)

and auditory and evaluation services that can be provided for such a unit by the staff of the regular school for the deaf. There are certain children who would be enrolled in the program who can benefit from partial or part-time residence integration and occasionally vocational integration into the regular school.

The views of the former superintendent on the future of ASD were summarized in section 4.10. They are his considered views about the way ASD should operate, and its features and characteristics, for the next 25 years. They are of sufficient importance to warrant reproduction in full here, despite their length.

1. A Comprehensive Education Centre
   The Provincial residential school offers the opportunity for having a comprehensive educational centre. This concept, well-founded in the historical justification for the residential school for the deaf, is important in that it provides deaf children who require such placement the access to a fully developed program.

   A. Early Intervention/Preschool
      A home program serving the rural or sparsely population area of the province should be the responsibility of the provincial residential school. This role in preschool education of deaf children should be assumed and developed by the provincial residential school because it is the resource most capable in organizing and conducting such a program that is educationally sound and that is the most comprehensive.

      The home program of a provincial residential school can draw upon the total resources of the comprehensive program and staff at the residential school. Ideally, the home program can bring the young deaf child and his parent(s) to the provincial school campus once or twice a year and conduct intensive training sessions in a simulated home environment using a cottage or small house on or near the campus. This, followed up with teacher visits to the home of the young deaf child and correspondence between teacher and parents can be a substantial beginning in the education of a young deaf child. Otherwise, his parents are miles from guidance and help or most settle for something less than a program fully committed to giving the child a good beginning.

      In most cases, the province should give priority

to enrolling preschool deaf children in a local school program. This will give the very young deaf child maximum opportunity to benefit from his family support during formative years.

B. Elementary

Without undue over-simplification, the demographic characteristic of Alberta is that it has metropolitan, urban, rural and sparse population densities.

In those areas of the province having a sufficient population of elementary-age deaf children and which can otherwise provide a comprehensive educational program meeting or exceeding minimum program standards such as outlined in the Recommended Organizational Policies in the Education of the Deaf, the elementary-age deaf child should receive his education in a local school program, but the local educational jurisdiction must utilize a variety of program strategies and adequately meet his needs.

There are still many areas in Alberta which cannot really initiate or maintain a well-graded, suitably supported, and properly housed comprehensive program. Elementary-age deaf children residing in these areas are equally entitled to a standard, comprehensive program placement. When reasonable and feasible, the province should insist that local educational jurisdictions disregard territorial domains and cluster a program serving as wide an attendance area as sensible transportation will permit.

When neither of the two previous program organizational plans are realistic, deaf children should be enrolled in the provincial residential school program if we are to assure each deaf child that educational chance to which he is entitled. Some elementary deaf children must be enrolled in the provincial schools as a necessary alternative if the goal is education. This point must be emphasized, because it is not uncommon for other goals to surface in these situations, and they may divert the focus of both parent and educator. There is only one, primary, and supreme goal for placing a child in a school -- to receive an education!

Other factors must be given due consideration. It is not unusual for a child's needs to be essentially unmet even though a comprehensive program is available and ought to meet the needs. In these special

situations, the local school program and the provincial residential school program, with the parents, must find another educational solution. This might be transfer to or from the residential school. It might be a creative adaptation of his existing program placement.

Residential schools and local programs must evaluate carefully when it is suggested that personal problems, social environment, or family life difficulties are offered as reasons for placement of an elementary deaf child in the residential school. These are not problems that schools, as social institutions, were designed to solve. Only when these kinds of problems impair the educational advantage of the deaf child can a residential school be used as the alternative school placement to the available local school program.

C. Secondary

With the exception to the functionally hard of hearing child who can truly benefit from instruction in some regular classes, and with exception to the ultra-urban areas supported by well-developed transportation systems, deaf secondary pupils in Alberta must be enrolled in the residential school as the only real alternative to a comprehensive secondary education opportunity.

When the basics of elementary education are completed, it is time to embark on preparation that begins to have life-career directions. It is a time when educators of the deaf and parents of the deaf student (and the student himself) must have a comprehensive, academic, and vocational program available. The provincial residential school provides the most comprehensive approach to the ever-increasingly complex and costly aspects of a wide ranging academic and occupational preparation program uniquely designed for deaf learners. Secondary education is the major enrollment in the Alberta School for the Deaf today, and this is properly so.

Local educational jurisdictions should not be permitted to initiate a secondary program for deaf children unless there is clear evidence that all components of a quality program can be provided and maintained -- all subjects at a variety of levels, a good variety of career training pursuits with a full range of support staff and services all provided by personnel trained to serve the deaf.

D. Multihandicapped

The same relationships of responsibility outlined for early intervention/preschool, elementary, and secondary should exist in the determination of a suitable school placement for a mildly or moderately multihandicapped deaf child. It is estimated that somewhere between ten percent - twenty percent of the provincial school enrollment requires an instructional strategy characteristically different from the rest of the program to meet the very special, individual needs of the compounded problems confronting the mildly or moderately MH-deaf child.

The relationship of responsibility suggested in this design for province-wide education for deaf children is the crucial element. Suffice to say at this time, there are important roles for each component of the public, separate and private school delivery system, there are key roles for individual specialists, administrators and parents. Like the symphony, each of the parts must communicate with the others, and they must blend to achieve the desired results.

II. Child Study/Assessment Services

Every handicapped child must have a comprehensive diagnostic/educational assessment leading to an individual plan of instruction.

The complex and often costly process of doing a complete child study when the child has a significant hearing loss and perhaps other handicaps will not be realized by simply enacting a mandate. Education programs must have a host of specialists who know deafness and understand the deaf individual. Such a team will be required to secure the child study base, to focus the findings from that base, to draw sound conclusions, to formulate program and special service recommendations that can be implemented to meet the unique needs of the child.

The talent pool of the necessary assessment-program planning specialist is and remains limited for some time. Alberta must recognize this fact along with the high cost in doing a quality job in this component. It should expect and require all comprehensive programs to have the minimum staff (considering kinds and quality), but that will not be enough (except on paper) for meeting the diversity of assessment/planning tasks presented by deaf and MH-deaf children. Alberta should centralize its best

and most experienced talent in the child study/ assessment services component at the Alberta School for the Deaf -- for the benefit of any child and his family irrespective of where or how he might be placed for his education. Such a design offers maximum utility of the rare talent available and is a cost-effective strategy for making sure that each deaf child and his family has access to a high quality service to plan and guide his educational experience.

There are examples of the effectiveness and efficiency of this design in the two state schools in California, in several regional programs in Illinois, and in the ATEC approach in Arizona.

III. Learning Resource Centre

The Alberta School for the Deaf is one of the few if not the only educational program in Alberta having a full-range program, a curriculum extending through all grades, and a complete staff of supporting specialists. The school should be expected to serve (and be funded) for a leadership role to benefit all programs throughout the province in such activities as:

1. Curriculum development.
2. Design and testing of instructional methods and materials of instruction.
3. Pioneering new instructional concepts such as Computer Aided Instruction and Instructional Television -- developing appropriate programs.
4. Design and development of new career educational avenues.
5. Testing equipment for instruction including educational amplification systems.
6. Organizing and conducting on/off campus inservice education opportunities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and others.
7. Design and development of parent education.
8. Maintenance of comprehensive library of books, materials, and research in the areas of deafness and the education of the deaf.
9. Focus and coordinate research efforts province-wide with dissemination.
10. Centralization of demographic data.
11. Formulation and development of new evaluation concepts, techniques, tests, etc.

It is important to conceptualize the leadership role of the Alberta School for the Deaf as the host or the place where all teachers and related

professionals collaborate and work together. There may be economy in centralization, but the power comes from the degree and quality of participation.

IV. Demonstration School

Relating significantly to the provincial school's role as a Learning Resource Centre, Alberta School for the Deaf should establish its role as a practicum centre for the preparation of teachers. It should be utilized for practicum purposes (observation, training, and internships) for teachers, psychologists, audiologists, diagnostic specialists, medically related fields, speech therapists, teacher aides, residence counselors, social workers, and others. The practicum experience focused in the Alberta School for the Deaf must be in planned cooperation with community college programs and University of Alberta.

The provincial school should also be a place where interested individuals and citizen groups can go for orientation and understanding of deafness. This is an important public duty that can ultimately benefit deaf individuals and the education of the deaf.

Teachers of the deaf and others are often desperate for relevant and meaningful inservice education opportunities. The provincial school, working on identified needs can play a key role in meeting this need.

V. Community/Continuing Education Centre

From almost any point of view (social, educational, economic) the provincial school must do more! This design suggests that a positive, new but expanded program for the residential schools is in leadership in community and continuing education for deaf individuals.

In spite of meritorious efforts in adult education and post-secondary education opportunities at community colleges for the deaf, this level of education for the deaf is still an awakening giant. If the giant is awake, he needs direction and guidance.

The Alberta School for the Deaf should be staffed with personnel who can initiate, plan, and marshall community resources that can contribute to the education of deaf individuals, especially adults, including, but not limited to, area adult education classes and community college programs.

> Likewise, the school itself should design and provide the needed instruction or activity desired by the deaf population it serves.
>
> There is no reason why the facilities of the Alberta School for the Deaf cannot and should not be used by adult deaf individuals and groups and community groups when not used by pupils. This concept includes recreational as well as instructional spaces and facilities.
>
> This component role does require a commitment for the Alberta School for the Deaf quite different from tradition. It takes new kinds of people, too. The concept is a proven one in communities all over Alberta. It is not yet a full-blown reality for the deaf, but it can be! It does take leadership to create a relationship of responsibility among resources and to help in coordinating or organizing these.
>
> This design in reshaping the role of the Alberta School for the Deaf conceptualizes that school as a renewed social system contributing significantly to the overall and continued improvement in the educational opportunity for deaf children, youth, and adults.

At this stage, it is proper to add one more item of information, presented in section 2.3. Additional handicapping conditions are found in 35 percent of deaf students enrolled in Canadian residential schools, in order of frequency as follows: emotional-behavioral problems, specific learning disability, cerebral palsy, mental retardation, uncorrected visual problems, etc.

Let us now try to summarize the needs which have been identified and the corresponding recommendations for provisions. It is estimated that about one percent of a population has severe handicaps. Alberta had about 423,000 school age children in the fall of 1982. The estimate of incidence of severe handicaps would mean 4,230 severely handicapped persons of school age (5 to 18). When Briggs made his survey of treatment centres for physically handicapped students, the directors identified assessment centres, and outreach, as future directions. Ann Alexander, quoted by Rodda, advocated that special schools focus on being observation and assessment centres, and advisory centres. Alberta already has an

excellent school hospital (Glenrose) and a similar facility (Alberta Children's Hospital) in Calgary. However, the Cascade hierarchy of provisions for special education distinguishes between hospital schools (Glenrose) and special residential schools (ASD). The McNeil report on the learning centre at ASD recommended that a special unit within ASD be developed to deal with multi-handicapped deaf students. Finally, a detailed report by Kelly Boesen, former Superintendent of ASD, advocated that in the future ASD provide the following services.

1. A comprehensive education centre.
2. A child study/assessment centre for deaf children.
3. A learning resources centre developing curriculum, pioneering new instructional approaches and concepts, developing parent education programs, etc.
4. A demonstration centre for parents and professionals throughout the province.
5. A community/continuing education centre, aiding and assisting the local community and in turn providing good social interaction; and aiding and assisting the deaf community in pursuing continuing education.

All of the foregoing can be summarized. The needs are continued improvement in education for the profoundly deaf; multi-disciplinary educational assessments; a practicum centre for the preparation of professionals especially teachers; a centre for research into deafness, deaf education and allied handicapping conditions; continuing education for deaf adults; and outreach in parent education in the broadest sense. All of this is related mainly to deafness. But the implication is that there are needs of other handicapped Albertans. The question then arises: is it most beneficial in a relatively small province of 2.4 million people to retain a specialized school, or could it safely be broadened to encompass other handicapping conditions for some of the needs outlined above?

9.3 ALTERNATIVE FUTURES

1. A School for the Deaf. There is no doubt in the minds of the principal evaluators that at present, the provision of a good quality of deaf education is the major mission of ASD. The overall assessment of the evaluation is that ASD is a good school. There is at present and there will continue to be a need for the kind of deaf education provided by ASD.

The recommendations of this report, if they can be implemented, are designed to make the good better. The Alberta Education consultants have made sound recommendations and can provide excellent quality in-service education. Regular, planned evaluations will provide tangible short term goals. Communication among staff will enrich the knowledge of each member, and on important program components should lead to coordinated activity by consensus. Coordination must and will be obtained, as it is essential to the proper functioning of the school. Staff members who have become used to "doing their own thing" will find that giving up this freedom of action will not be easy. But the independence will be replaced by a group spirit of shared and accepted goals.

Integration of students can be pursued by many means which have been recommended. Integration, in the sense of familiarization with the hearing world, and ability to live and work in the hearing world, is most desirable for all students, including the deaf. Standards of school achievement can and will be improved. This does not mean that every deaf child will become a Rhodes scholar. As with the hearing there will be "good, bad, and indifferent". Parent education and parent participation will greatly increase parent support of ASD. It will also help by informing, by providing opportunities for sharing, by seeking parental input, and by firmly indicating that direction of staff and of teaching methods is not a parental perogative. A firm, fair, consistent administration will provide the leadership the teaching staff so badly wanted. Residence provisions will continue to be recognized as facilitating social, personal, and educational development. In the words of Wick "Albertans have reason to be proud of ASD".

The other needs summarized at the end of 9.2 are currently being met to some extent, particularly multi-disciplinary educational assessment

for the currently enrolled students. But others are not as prominent of extensive as they could and should be, particularly research into deafness, and deaf education; and outreach in parent education, and in providing help to other juristictions in the education of the deaf.

It is appropriate at this point to speculate on future enrollment at ASD. If circumstances remain as they have been, it is anticipated that enrollment might drop to 115 (see section 6.6). However, in the 1982-83 school year there were efforts by some parents to arrange for the Edmonton Public School system to accept some deaf students. A number of parents seemed inclined to take advantage of this opportunity for an alternative educational program. It might be that in 1983-84 enrollment in ASD would be less than 100. Immediately there would be pressure to cut staff, unless plans were in hand for utilizing their strengths in alternate functions. An enrollment of less than 100 would reduce the efficiency of the school in terms of grouping of students and range of offering. While speculating on enrollment, in the middle range for 1993-94, there is every reason to believe that the number of profoundly deaf in Alberta will be as high or higher than now. Whether Edmonton public and/or separate school districts will undertake to provide alternate schooling, particularly at the elementary school level for some of the severely and fewer of the profoundly deaf is a matter of speculation. An important determiner is the size of government unit grants.

If the role of the school remains much as it is at present, the changes in governance could be to make the present advisory board a school board, to attempt to make the board the virtual end of the "appeal against decisions" procedures, to make the board a truly policy making body by persuading members not to attempt to intervene directly in the operation of the school, and to make the board more representative. Alternatively, the model of NAIT or the Community Colleges could be followed, where the control by government is restricted to budgetary control. The ASD board could then be an independent though appointed body, which employed its own staff, managed its own budget, and made its own policy. Staff would no longer be civil servants and could elect whatever representation they wished to accept. If this were to be the alternative, the representativeness of the board would have to

be closely examined.

For alternative future 1 there is no reason to suggest any change in name. It could still be The Alberta School for the Deaf.

2. A Research and Demonstration Centre in the Faculty of Education, University of Alberta.

Early in 1983 the University of Alberta made this proposal. Some quotations will serve to describe it.

> The proposal is designed to bring together a number of widely perceived needs. These needs are:
>
> 1. To upgrade the educational and vocational achievements of deaf students.
> 2. To improve the quality of teaching training for teachers of the deaf and to provide a model for the training of other teachers.
> 3. To make available to smaller school districts the resources of trained consultants and personnel with skills in the assessment and educational programming of deaf students.
> 4. To provide a regional resource, particularly for Saskatchewan and Manitoba in teacher training and in research and development.
> 5. To improve "early detection", particularly of more moderate hearing losses.
> 6. To improve the support and counselling of deaf students and their families.
> 7. To develop academic upgrading programs, and facilitate the entry of deaf students into post-secondary education.
> 8. To improve service delivery by assuring better coordination and integration of existing social, medical, psychological and educational services.

The premises on which the proposal rests were as follows. The 1974 discussion paper (see section 4.2) advocated a comprehensive program for the training and education of the deaf, including early detection and training in communication; formal schooling; opportunities for further education; a counselling service; and a mitigation of some of the serious disadvantages of institutional living by decentralization (including a satellite campus in Calgary), and the development of group homes. The proposal made by the University of Alberta indicates that the features described have never been properly implemented. It assumes that it would be desirable to educate post-secondary deaf students in Canada, and that Alberta can and should become a "centre of excellence" in the research, training, and educational aspects of deafness. The features of the research and

demonstration centre are described below.

A Research and Demonstration Centre

The University of Alberta Faculty of Education believes it is now appropriate to propose an innovation in services which will be of considerable potential benefit to deaf students and their parents, to the adult deaf community and in the training of teachers. The proposal is to designate the Alberta School for the Deaf as a Research and Demonstration Centre attached to the Faculty of Education of the University of Alberta, and to establish a similar kind of relationship as now exists for the University Hospital. Funding of the "service functions" would remain the responsibility of Alberta Education just as funding of the "research and training" aspects would remain the responsibility of Alberta Advanced Education and Manpower. Appropriate university Faculty would hold honorary positions on the staff of the Centre, and selected staff at the Centre would have similar positions in the Faculty of Education. Management would be the responsibility of a Director reporting directly to the Dean of Education and this position would carry appropriate status in the Faculty of Education. There would be no immediate changes in the management structure of the present school and at least for an interim period the budget and financing would continue as at present.

The proposal outlines a statistical base, and goes on to anticipate changes in existing programs, and anticipate additional new programs.

Changes in Existing Programs

Over the next five years a number of changes are proposed in the existing services of the Alberta School for the Deaf. These are the natural outcome of changed policies and practices and will occur independently of any action such as it suggested in this proposal. However, establishing a Research and Demonstration Centre will facilitate dealing with:

1. A reduction in the number of primary school and elementary age students leaving only a small number of classes of students whose parents choose a "school for the deaf" setting (e.g. deaf parents of deaf children and children with special needs particularly those with difficult home circumstances or those in need of short-term remediation for behavioral and other problems).
2. The abolition of the present "dormitory arrangements" and replacing them with a "group home" program as envisaged in the 1974 report. Such programs will be managed separately from the school programs.
3. Increased pressure to realistically relate the curriculum of the school to the general Alberta curriculum, and increased pressure to make the school more accountable for the academic performance of its students.
4. Increased awareness of the need for a program of clinical assessment and whether through the Centre or elsewhere of better early identification programs.

5. Increased status for American Sign Language, and a better understanding of its role in the classroom and in the teaching of English as a foreign language.
6. Increasing focus on pre-vocational programs and perhaps, on more vocationally orientated programs.
7. Increasing involvement in counselling both of students and parents, and of the need for positive mental health programmes for deaf students.
8. An increased or an increasingly recognized number of problem students - particularly those with behavioral problems.
9. Increased involvement in preparatory programs for post-secondary students, as discussed by the Council of Ministers of Education in 1982.
10. Growing involvement in teacher training and the upgrading and in-service training of teachers and others in the school and elsewhere.

Additional New Programs

There are a number of new programs that are likely to develop in Alberta during the next 5 to 10 years. Some of these could not be appropriately considered part of Alberta School for the Deaf as presently constituted. They could be appropriately considered part of a Research and Demonstration Centre attached to the Faculty of Education at the University of Alberta. They are:

1. A growing research program into "sign language" and those aspects of the deaf culture which have practical applications to the development of a positive self image in deaf students.
2. The development of programs for training teachers of sign language.
3. The development of training programs for counsellors working with deaf students and adults - the proposed program for training "rehabilitation counsellors" at the University of Alberta is a first step along this route.
4. The development of an effective preparatory program for "high flying" academic students and a growing involvement of the Community College and University sector in the education of deaf students.
5. An upgrading of the entry level qualifications for teachers of the deaf.
6. The development of effective programs for training new and existing teachers in the teaching of speech to deaf students.
7. A growing program of "social work" for deaf adults and deaf students and their families.
8. A growing basic research program into auditory and perceptual processing in deaf and other sensory handicapped students.
9. A growing program of administrative and policy research in deaf education - ranging, at present, from basic demographic research to the quantitative aspects of the evaluation of the school for the deaf.

The proposal continues by noting that the "Deaf Community" has requested a Commission on Deafness for a number of years. Similar commissions

"Quangas" (quasi autonomous non-governmental organization funded by the government) have served to improve services and to protect government agencies and universities from unfair scapegoating. Therefore, an Alberta Commission on Deafness is included in the University of Alberta proposal. Time lines and provisions for evaluation and monitoring complete the proposal.

3. An Alberta Centre for Education of the Deaf

The third alternative future for ASD is by analogy much closer to the composite high school concept. The present ASD is like a special school such as a vocational or an academic high school. At this stage a new name should be sought, such as "Alberta Centre for Deafness Education". This title still indicates that education takes place, but shifts the focus to the idea that it is a centre of studies and practice in deafness education.
However, this title is much more descriptive of the next 25 years as seen by Kelly Boesen:

1. A comprehensive educational centre.
2. A child study/assessment centre.
3. A Learning Resource Centre
4. A Training/Demonstration Centre.
5. Community/Continuing Education Centre.

The centre would stress educational assessment and monitoring, research into deafness education, practicum services for teacher education, and the provision of deaf education. It would extend the range of education of the deaf upward, to age 20 or 21, by extension of proven integration with nearby schools and colleges. If found desirable and feasible it would in practice extend the range downward to age 3 as the lower limit. A number of the needs and new program features identified in the preceding alternative could be filled by this Centre.
As with the fourth alternative described next, governance could follow different models. One would be direct operation of the Centre by the government. Another would be the NAIT or Community College model of an autonomous Board, with funding provided by the government and by fees levied against school districts.
It is recognized that the difference between alternative 2 and alternative 3 is small, and lies primarily in whether the Phoenix was

attached to the University.

4. A Centre for Exceptional Children

This alternative is by analogy a truly composite or comprehensive thrust into the assessment, education and preparation of children who are exceptional. The first group, and one which would be guaranteed an assured place, would be the deaf who require the kind of services and facilities currently provided by ASD. The centre is thought of as a comprehensive centre, and assurance of continued and continuing provision for deafness could be provided by a system of earmarked budgets.

It is proposed that the centre would, like an active treatment hospital, accept other exceptional children for educational assessment and monitoring, and for the planning and trying out of educational programs, for a maximum period of two years. Since additional buildings would be required, the extension of the centre beyond deafness would have to be phased in. A suggested order would start with the gifted, then those with learning disabilities, then the mentally retarded, and so on, phased over several years. In addition to the two year maximum, it is proposed that a numerical maximum of (say) 40-50 be specified for each of the gifted, learning disabled, mentally retarded, etc.

The avowed purpose of such a centre would be twofold: to continue to offer quality education to the deaf, and to attempt to develop the best possible education for all exceptional children including the deaf. Assessment, educational programming, try-out, and monitoring would be at the heart of the operations of the centre.

The advantages of such a centre would be clear. Not the least is that various kinds of "exceptionalities" are seldom found alone; rather, the opposite is frequently the case. We have noted on several occasions that 35 percent of deaf children in Canada have other handicapping conditions. Because different kinds of exceptionalities, with different degrees of severity would be present, the centre would be ideal for teacher education practicums and practicums for other professionals. Similarly, it would be excellent for research into effective educational programs, and into changes or development in students which should call for reassessment and reprogramming.

Teachers ordinarily face multiple handicapping conditions in students: the centre would provide an opportunity for familiarity with all. It would also be an excellent training ground for integration: the deaf with the gifted, both of these with the learning disabled, and so on. In practical terms, for Alberta with 2.4 million people, one such centre would have the appropriate population base.

A question raised by such a proposal is why duplicate the excellent services of the Glenrose Hospital and the Alberta Childrens' Hospital? Undoubtedly some duplication might occur if the proposed centre dealt with the severely physically handicapped and with the emotionally disturbed. The principal evaluators do not have the breadth of knowledge to answer the question posed. However, the proposal is for <u>educational</u> assessment and programming, rather than for <u>medical</u>. As described, the centre would focus on implications for education.

If a careful review by more knowledgeable people found merit in this proposal, a new name would have to be found more descriptive of new functions. The name proposed is <u>The Lougheed Centre for Exceptional Children</u>. A centre implies that this is much more than a school. Research centres, and assessment centres, are common enough to have a familiar ring. The term "exceptional children" covers the breadth desired, indicating all kinds of exceptionality, and not focus on the negative as "handicapped" does.

The advantages of ASD being the Phoenix are many. Its 33 acres provide considerable space for the necessary buildings. ASD is close to The University of Alberta, which already has a renowned centre for the study of mental retardation; an excellent education clinic which deals with emotional problems as they affect education, and with reading disabilities; and a staff and graduate students who could use the facilities of the Lougheed Centre to tremendous advantage in furthering knowledge in the education of exceptional children. ASD has an excellent support staff which could form the seed or nucleus for the educational assessment and monitoring proposed. ASD also has some of the equipment required, at least at the level of seed or nucleus.

One genuine fear which may be aroused by this proposal is that the deaf might be swamped by students with other exceptionalities. This kind of

fear was no doubt in the minds of many parents and educators when, in Edmonton, the Edmonton Commercial High School and the Edmonton Vocational High School were displaced by the then new and revolutionary Victoria Composite High School. Business education and Industrial education have not suffered. In fact, the composite nature of the new schools has strengthened both. Whether this analogy would apply to ASD, deafness education, and the proposed centre is not certain, but the principal evaluators think it would apply. We see no reason why the centre as such should reduce the importance of deaf education. Nor should it impair ASD as a centre for the deaf. Throughout this report various proposals have been made which would foster this aspect, and in the centre they could be implemented.

Governance could follow one of three models. One is briefly outlined in alternative 2. If The University of Alberta, and the Faculty of Education were willing, they could administer the centre as a teaching/assessment/research/laboratory/practicum arm. The government could supply the funds for the provision of facilities, staff, and direct service provided by the centre, and could support the teaching/assessment/research/laboratory/practicum through the university budget. A representative Board for the centre would be responsible for operation, and the Dean of the Faculty of Education would have a positional placement on the Board. A second model could be that of NAIT or the Community Colleges. A representative Board appointed by the government with its own budget, would operate the Centre. The third model is that the centre could be operated directly by the government as ASD is now, with a different and more representative Board.

This proposal is comprehensive and costly. If adopted, the Centre could serve as a nucleus for cooperation and rationalization of the diverse and feisty parts or aspects of exceptionality.

9.4 Conclusion

The evaluation of the Alberta School for the Deaf was conducted by principal evaluators S.C.T. Clarke and V.R. Nyberg during seven months from October 1982 to April 1983. The terms of reference determined the nature and scope of the evaluation. Because the evaluation was

sparked by concerns of parents, this report was written with parents in mind. It commences with a sketchy overview of deafness, deafness education, parents of deaf children, and a description of ASD.

The principal evaluators are convinced that the procedures used in the evaluation were appropriate and adequate. External specialists and Alberta Education consultants provided input chiefly on the instructional program. Opinions of stakeholders were sought by interview, and by questionnaires based in part on the interviews. The procedure of permitting anonymity on parent questionnaires and relying on a telephone follow-up worked well. (In passing, it can be noted that two more questionnaires came in too late for inclusion. In fact, the response of parents was 69.2 percent. It is also of interest that on item 26 "ASD is a very good school" both parents marked "A" agree). While the questionnaires were slightly flawed in some instances, in the main they were sound, valid, and reliable.

Among the diversities of view found were two very significant points of agreement: the use of Total Communication, and that the Alberta School for the Deaf is a good school.

The evaluation identified several important areas for improvement: the need for continuing evaluations; the need for communication and coordination; the need for continuing efforts to familiarize deaf students with the hearing world; the need for higher standards of student achievement; the need for parent education; the need for firm, fair, and consistent administration; and the need to continue to stress the educational, social, and personal development features of residence provisions.

The many commendations and recommendations of the section on instructional program should provide valuable guidance for the instructional staff. The descriptions of courses and programs may be of wider interest.

Finally, looking ahead the principal evaluators sketched four possible futures for ASD. Because a choice among them may involve considerations far beyond an evaluation of ASD, they were proposed without recommendation.

V.R. Nyberg

S.C.T. Clarke

REFERENCES

Baker, Charlotte and Battison, Robin (editors). Sign Language and the Deaf Community: Essays in Honor of William C. Stokoe. National Association of the Deaf, Washington, D.C. 1980.

Briggs, J.W. A Comparative Survey of Treatment Centres for Physically Handicapped Children. Unpublished. 270 pages, 1980.

Brill, Richard G. Administrative and Professional Developments in the Education of the Deaf. Gallaudet College Press, Washington, D.C. 1971.

Freeman, Roger D.; Carbin, Clifton F.; and Boese, Robert J. Can't Your Child Hear?: A Guide for Those Who Care About Deaf Children. University Park Press, Baltimore, 1981.

Jacobs, Leo M. A Deaf Adult Speaks Out (2nd edition). Gallaudet Press, 1980.

Mindel, Eugene D. and Vernon McKay. They Grow in Silence: The Deaf Child and His Family. National Association of the Deaf, Maryland, 1971.

Moores, Donald F. Educating the Deaf: Psychology, Principles, and Practices. Houghton-Mifflin, 1978. Revised edition, 1982.

Nash, Jeffrey E. and Nash, Anedith. Deafness In Society. Heath, , 1981.

Karchmer, Michael A.; Allen, Thomas E.; Petersen, Linda M. and Quaynor, Alexander. "Hearing-Impaired Children and Youth in Canada: Student Characteristics in Relation to Manual Communication Patterns in Four Special Education Settings." American Annals of the Deaf. April, 1982.

Rodda, Michael. "An Analysis of the Myth that Mainstreaming and Integration are Synonymous" in Deaf People and Social Change. Working Paper #6, Conference on Sociology of Deafness, Gallaudet College. Conference Papers edited by Boros, Alexander and Stuckless, Ross. 1980.

APPENDIX I

ALBERTA SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF EVALUATION

Report by

John L. Anderson, Principal, R. J. D. Williams
Provincial School for the Deaf,
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

Introduction

This report is based on information obtained during a five day visit to the Alberta School for the Deaf, and will form part of a larger evaluation report on the school.

During the visit from December 6-10, 1982, I worked with Mrs. Bernice Ryan of Belleville, Ontario and Mr. Marshall Wick of Washington, D.C., both of whom will be submitting separate reports on their observations during that week. Under the schedule set out for us by Drs. Clarke and Nyberg, we each observed and evaluated various areas of the school program and shared our perceptions in general meetings chaired by Dr. Clarke.

This report will cover my evaluation of the educational program based on visits to twelve classrooms ranging from beginning to graduating levels; a tour of the Program of W. P. Wagner Vocational High School; and discussions with the Superintendent, Principal, Vice Principal, Teacher Seniors and Teachers. The report will also include my evaluation of the School's Residential and Off Campus Living Program based on visits to the dormitories, and the on campus houses, and discussions with the Superintendent, the Acting Dean of Residence, Houseparents, the School Social Worker and resident students.

At the outset I would like to acknowledge the assistance provided by my fellow evaluators and thank the administration, staff and students of the school for their open and co-operative approach to my evaluation, and for the vast amount of helpful information they provided.

My purpose in writing this report is to assist decision makers within Alberta Education and the Alberta School for the Deaf to bring about changes that will continue to ensure the best quality education for those hearing-impaired students in the Province who attend the School. While I obviously refer to my many years of experience teaching and working with deaf children in a variety of settings, I have avoided comparing the

Alberta School with my own School in Saskatchewan or any other system that I have been part of. Rather I have concentrated on my observations, discussions and the background material so readily provided. I trust that my comments will be viewed constructively and that this report will contribute in some way to a richer education for deaf children in Alberta.

Schedule

	Monday Dec. 6	Tuesday Dec. 7	Wednesday Dec. 8	Thursday Dec. 9	Friday Dec. 10
A.M.	Orientation Meeting - Drs. Clarke/ Nyberg Meeting with School Administration	Classroom Visits Basic 1 9M Math 8B Language Arts 8G Science	Classroom Visits English 13 Physical Education Teacher Conferences	Tour of the Residences - Superintendent & Dean of Residence Meetings with Resident Students	Meetings with other Evaluators Perception Sharing with Administration
P.M.	Classroom Visits Beginning Class Basic 3 Class Basic 4 Class Meetings with Alberta Educational Consultants and Evaluators	7G Home Economics 10B Communications PV2 Mathematics Teacher Conferences	Teacher Conferences	Meeting with Social Worker Meetings with Houseparents Visits to Dormitories Visit to the On Campus Houses - Meetings with Staff and Students	Visit to W.P. Wagner Vocational High School Meetings with teachers observed

1. ADMINISTRATION

The school follows the American Model of Residential Schools for the Deaf, headed by a Superintendent with its own Principal, Vice-Principal, Dean of Residence, Teacher Seniors, Bursar, Housekeeper and their respective staffs. Like most schools for the deaf across Canada, the Alberta School falls directly under the Alberta Department of Education and the staff are members of the Alberta Union of Public Employees.

1.1 While each member of the administrative staff has his/her own area of responsibility, there appears to be considerable overlap and some confusion of roles. This confusion is particularly apparent when the roles of Superintendent, Principal, Vice-Principal and Teacher Seniors are examined. Perhaps the inevitable overlap in the roles of Superintendent and Principal is the reason all other Western Provinces have made the Principal head of

the school, and abolished the position of Superintendent. At the Alberta School for the Deaf, the situation becomes more complicated by the fact that the Vice-Principal reports directly to the Superintendent and not the Principal, thereby creating a division of authority which is not well understood by the teaching staff, and must in some way lessen the effectiveness of the Principal.

Recommendation

That the duties of each member of the administrative staff be carefully reviewed and areas of overlap be clarified. With the recent resignation of the Superintendent, it is appropriate to review the entire administrative structure of the School. I recommend that this be done with a view to clarifying roles and providing a clearer line of authority and responsibility. The position of Principal must be carefully considered. In most Canadian schools, the Principal is the head of the school and is responsible for all areas that affect the student. A school for the deaf should not differ from other schools with the exception that it provides boarding facilities and therefore requires the necessary services to support a twenty-four hour program.

1.2 Granted, the role of the Vice-Principal may change depending on the outcome of 1.1 above, however, the present role of the Vice-Principal is unclear, particularly as the position reports to the Superintendent and not the Principal. The Vice-Principal is primarily responsible for the student support services at the School. Such services include speech therapy, audiology, psychology and guidance, occupational therapy, social work and the audio-visual and library areas. The Vice-Principal also co-ordinates the language program throughout the school.

Recommendation

The position of Vice-Principal should report directly to the Principal. Duties may change following a review of the administrative system. However, as support services are an integral part of the educational program and as language is the most important area in the program of a School for the Deaf, the present responsibilities of the Vice-Principal must be linked directly to the Principal, who has overall responsibility for the educational program.

1.3 The role of the teacher-senior position is particularly confusing and requires careful review. It appears that previously, this position was seen to be that of a Department Head and has recently transferred to that

of a master-teacher. Each of the three teacher-seniors was assigned a particular subject area, and is responsible for co-ordinating that subject throughout the school. Teacher-Seniors are also expected to carry a teaching assignment for the first time this year.

Recommendation

While the newly defined role of the teacher-senior has many advantages, the teaching staff is confused by the changes and the teacher-seniors themselves do not appear at all clear as to how their new roles are defined. As a master-teacher, rather than a supervisor, the teacher-senior has the opportunity to assist teachers through help with planning, curriculum development, demonstration lessons, etc. without the pressure of evaluation. As a department co-ordinator the teacher-senior can work with the Principal to ensure the efficient operation of his/her department. Areas of confusion seem to centre around the new assignment given to the teacher-seniors this year. While it is imperative that teacher-seniors work together under the direction of the Principal, the assigning of subject areas to different teacher-seniors appears to be causing concern as it requires the teacher-senior to move out of his department into the area of another teacher-senior. Hence staff are not sure to whom they report and the teacher-seniors are cautious of invading another person's territory. It is recommended that a clear job description be developed for the teacher-senior which will allow him/her to co-ordinate his/her department more effectively under the direction of the Principal. Teaching assignments and/or direct student contact should be maintained, but sufficient time must be allowed to enable the teacher-senior to be of real assistance in all areas to the teachers in his/her department.

1.4 Although the present Assistant Dean of Residence is acting in the position of Dean at this time, the two positions remain on the staffing list. The Dean works during the day and is responsible for supervision and management of the residence program. A Housekeeper supervises the child care attendants who work with the children in the mornings and at lunch time.

Recommendation

That careful consideration be given as to the necessity of continuing both the Dean and Assistant Dean positions. As many houseparent staff indicated that they would welcome more direct involvement and support from the

administration, it might be of benefit to have the Dean of Residence work during the hours when the residence program is in full operation. While it is recognized that certain administrative tasks require the Dean to work during office hours, the compromise of a 12 noon - 9:00 P.M. shift might be considered. Again, with the Dean of Residence reporting directly to the Superintendent and the Housekeeper reporting to the Bursar, there appears to be an area of possible conflict or overlap. As child care attendants spend 40% of their time working with the children, it would seem appropriate that the Housekeeper report to the Dean of Residence in all areas related to the residence program.

2. INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

2.1 Organization

The educational program headed by the Principal is divided into three departments: junior, intermediate/senior, and pre-vocational. Each Department is co-ordinated by a teacher-senior who reports to the Principal. Student support services are provided by a variety of professional staff headed by the Vice-Principal.

The school has 145 students aged between five and eighteen years. Grade 10 accreditation has been approved by Alberta Education and classes progress through a series of levels to this standard. The Junior Department is divided into "general" and "basic" levels. Students who perform in the top academic range are assigned to general level classes, while those functioning at or below average levels are assigned to basic level classes. The lower functioning students in the Intermediate Department are placed on modified programs. While at the senior levels, they are streamed into the Pre-Vocational Department where they may eventually attend off campus vocational programs.

Student services such as speech therapy, audiology, counselling and occupational therapy are provided by qualified personnel as needed. Such services are available to students at any stage of their school lives.

Recommendations

2.1.1 While the basic division of the educational program into three departments is appropriate and seems to work well, closer co-operation between departments is required. A lack of knowledge and/or understanding of the work done by teachers in other departments was apparent. Teachers

in the Junior Department tended to see themselves as separate from the rest of the school, while teachers in the Pre-Vocational and Senior Departments would benefit greatly from more interaction. The design of the school with its separate staff rooms adds to this unfortunate division, but a great deal could be done through general staff meetings on an in-service nature concerning topics of interest to all teachers of the deaf.

2.1.2 Although there are assigned co-ordinators of various subjects, there do not appear to be subject meetings. Teachers of language, mathematics and/or science report that they were not meeting regularly to discuss areas of interest or concern to them. Such meetings should form a major part in developing a co-ordinated program throughout the school, and would provide an excellent opportunity for teachers in different departments to work together.

2.1.3 While individual differences are to be recognized and respected, there is great danger in labelling children too early in their school lives. It is not clear how students are placed into the basic or general level classes in the Junior Department or once there, how they can get out of this stream. Students in the basic stream may be denied good role models and because the teacher believes they are lower functioning students, they are not expected to perform as well as students in the general level classes, and this could result in a lack of challenge or motivation.

2.1.4 Deaf children require an integrated approach to learning. Work being taught in social studies, for example, must draw on knowledge and language gained in other subjects. Teach specialization and student rotation before the child has grasped the "basics" through an integrated learning approach can be detrimental to the child's progress. It is therefore recommended that students in the junior department and the younger intermediate students not rotate more than is necessary but take all their "general" subjects from their home-room teacher.

2.1.5 Students at all levels of the school, but particularly in the junior and intermediate departments are missing a lot of valuable class time to attend speech therapy or occupational therapy classes. While it is strongly recommended that teachers of the hearing impaired be primarily responsible for teaching speech to their students, it is recognized that certain circumstances may call for extra help. In these cases, every

effort must be made to avoid breaking into the lesson. Students cannot afford to miss vital parts of a lesson because they are at speech or in the resource room, etc. Wherever possible student services should be provided in the classroom where specialist personnel can be of invaluable support to the teacher. Specialist personnel may supplement but must never replace the classroom teacher.

2.1.6 Some students require extra help that can be effectively provided through a resource room program. However, the value of such a program is determined by the entry and exist criteria. In other words, a resource room teacher should work on specific learning needs for each child she sees. Such needs should be identified by the classroom teacher and a specific program drawn up with a definite time limit stated. The aim of the resource program should be to return the child to the classroom as soon as possible with the skills necessary to succeed. Again, the resource room teacher is only there to assist the classroom teacher by providing a "boost" to the child. Classroom teachers must know why a particular child attends the resource program and definite learning targets need to be identified.

2.2 Curriculum

The Alberta Curriculum has recently been implemented in the School and all teachers have been instructed to follow it's scope and sequence. Students were assigned to different levels of the curriculum last September and it is expected that they will work through the material on a year to year basis.

Teachers have also been issued copies of the Alberta Curriculum Guide for the Hearing Impaired and are expected to incorporate into their teaching the guidelines set out in this work. We were informed that the text "Sentences and Other Systems" by Blackwell, et al was the major resource in the language area, while the "Ling Model" for teaching speech as set out in the text "Speech and the Hearing Impaired Child: Theory and Practice" by Danie Ling was being followed throughout the school.

2.2.1 Observations and Recommendations re the Alberta Curriculum

Without having studied the Alberta Curriculum in any depth, it is agreed that the content material in regular curricula is generally appropriate for deaf children. However, as most curricula are written for the majority of school-aged children, special consideration must be given to

the learning needs of hearing-impaired children when using this material in Schools for the Deaf. With their added language and communication difficulties, deaf children often require more time to grasp material than do their hearing counterparts. While it can be argued that 100% understanding or competence is not required for satisfactory learning, a basic foundation must be formed in order to benefit from the new material being presented. Therefore, it is recommended that the requirement for teachers to complete one grade level in a given year be reviewed. A committee should be established to go through each curriculum guide and determine the core components that must be taught in a given year. Additional content may be added once the core material is completed, or given to individual students who are able to work at a faster pace. Trying to "push" a deaf student through the volume of material suggested for the average hearing child may well result in inefficient learning. Whereas given more time, the child should be able to handle the material quite satisfactorily.

The one area of the curriculum which is presenting most concern to teachers is the language arts area. As hearing is a major factor in communication and language learning, most severe to profoundly deaf children enter the school system with skills in these areas which are far below those of their hearing peers. Usually such low language and communication levels preclude the use of regular instruction, as the material designed for hearing children assumes certain basic knowledge and competence at the level of entry. It is therefore recommended that the Alberta Education language arts curriculum be used only as a supplementary guide where appropriate and the Alberta School for the Deaf adopt one of the many language curricula written specifically for deaf children. Such as curriculum must present a clear hierarchy of language skills and ensure a consistent development of linguistic competency throughout the school. Teachers in all subjects must match cognitive with linguistic functioning and it will be necessary to change much of the reading material in order to tie concept levels to the child's language levels.

In classroom observations, it was noted that many teachers felt uncomfortable with the way they were using the Alberta Curriculum. It must be stressed that like all curricula the Alberta Curriculum is meant to be a guide, and the teacher as a professional has the right and the duty to

adapt that guide to meet the needs of his/her particular students. It was not clear how particular subject levels were assigned to groups of students and some teachers were concerned that their students may have missed valuable information provided at an earlier level. Again the problem of time and language need to be addressed and teachers must meet regularly to determine the most effective way to adapt the Alberta Curriculum to the needs of their students.

2.2.2 Observations and Recommendations re the Hearing Impaired Curriculum Guide

While all teachers were concerned with teaching the Alberta Curriculum to their students, few were familiar with the content or goals of the Hearing-Impaired Curriculum Guide. As the material is still relatively new, it is recommended that in-service implementation workshops be provided to help teachers become familiar with the guide and determine the most effective way this new material can be integrated with existing material.

It should be noted while the Alberta Hearing Impaired Curriculum Guide provides valuable resource material for teachers of hearing impaired children it will be of most use to teachers at the School when used as a support document to Alberta Curricula materials or the detailed language curriculum for deaf children recommended above. The section on communication modes including sign language and speech should provide useful direction for programming within the school.

2.2.3 Observations and Recommendations re Language and Speech Curricula for the Hearing Impaired

As already mentioned above, the staff should select one of the many good language curricula designed for the hearing-impaired. While the text "Sentences and Other Systems, A Language and Learning Curriculum for Hearing Impaired Children" by Blackwell, et al, is an extremely valuable language resource book for teachers of the hearing impaired, it is not, despite its name, a curriculum guide in the sense of providing the hierarchy of language skills required by deaf students. Blackwell's material is based on the Rhode Island Language Curriculum (1979), which more clearly sets out learning outcomes in a recommended sequence.

From conversations with teachers and classroom observations, it is clear that the teachers require more help in teaching language to deaf children. Although some teachers referred to Blackwell's sentence patterns, there was

little evidence of a consistent approach to teaching language and insufficient diagnostic data to explain why students were following the particular program they were on. A great deal of in-service work is required to help teachers understand the language needs of their students and program accordingly. I do not see it necessary to bring in language experts at this time as there is a large amount of literature available and considerable knowledge and talent on the School Staff. What is needed, is for the teachers to work together and look deeply into what they are teaching and why particular materials or techniques are being used.

A similar approach to in-service work is required in the areas of speech and audition. I have already stated that the prime role of teaching speech to deaf students lies with the classroom teacher of the hearing impaired. I do not see how the "Ling Model" of teaching speech can be used appropriately where this is not the case. Under Ling's principles, speech is not a subject per se but an integral part of the teaching program and introduced in short intervals throughout the day.

Obviously, deaf teachers will need help in teaching speech, and I would recommend that specialist speech teachers, teacher-seniors and/or the speech therapists provide this assistance. However, even in this situation, speech and auditory habilitation should be part of the classroom activities wherever possible. Of considerable concern is the apparent lack of emphasis or programming for senior students in the areas of speech and audition. No group auditory trainers are provided to seniors and many students were not wearing personal hearing aids. I strongly recommend that a total communication environment including speech and amplification be provided immediately to all students throughout the school.

2.3 Classroom Observations

The following recommendations are based on observations in the classroom and from discussions held with teachers during assigned conference times.

2.3.1 Long and Short Term Goals

As stated earlier all teachers were willing to share their long and short term goals and discussion on planning formed a major part of the teacher conferences. While all teachers had written goals, there was a great variety in style and presentation. Some teachers had taken their goals directly from the Alberta Curriculum, while others had spent considerable time writing

their goals in an objective format and tailoring them to the individual needs of their students. I would recommend that all teachers be helped to write their goals and objectives in a clear task oriented form. Targets should be easily identified and competency levels established. The School Administration will need to give further attention to what is expected of the teachers and the way such planning might be carried out consistently throughout the School.

2.3.2 Teaching Styles

While each teacher has his/her own style dependent on the individual, the student and in part the subject material, some general observations on teaching strategies were observed. First, teacher expectations should be based on a clear understanding of student needs which can best be obtained through ongoing evaluation. Formal and informal language testing must be conducted by the teacher and the results obtained used to form the basis of programming. Language samples both written (formal) and oral (informal) should be collected and analyzed to determine where the child fits into the hierarchy of linguistic skills. When the teacher's expectations are raised, the student will offer higher quality work. In the language areas teachers must grasp any opportunity to expand the child's language and not be so ready to accept linguistic fragments or concepts only. A more interactive, conversational approach to teaching could be stressed throughout the school with plenty of opportunity for students to work together and learn from each other. Granted, there are times for "teacher dominated" lessons, but deaf children are not good passive learners, and teachers must constantly watch for opportunities to involve all students in the lesson and make good use of the language and ideas being expressed among them.

Secondly, some teachers could make better use of opportunities for incidental learning especially in the areas of speech and language. I observed very few examples of incidental speech teaching, though there were many situations where the students could have been helped and speech targets reinforced.

2.3.3 Audio/Visual Materials

The School is very well equipped with up to date learning materials and audio-visual aids. Of particular note is the availability of captioned films, television decoders, and telephone devices for the deaf. Although I did not observe a great deal of use being made of this audio-visual

equipment, teachers appeared to be well aware of what was available and how it could be assessed. Of concern however, was some reluctance among teachers to use the microcomputer in their teaching. Lack of suitable soft ware was quoted as part of the problem, but on going inservice on computer use in the classroom would be beneficial and should be implemented.

2.3.4 Learning Materials

Again, the School is very well supplied with a large variety of learning materials. Despite this availability of prepared material, teachers must still use a lot of their own materials which can often be made to better suit the language and cognitive needs of the deaf child than even the best commercially prepared workbooks or other materials. Teachers must not become dependent on workbooks but use a variety of approaches to students' learning and recording materials.

2.3.5 W. P. Wagner Vocational High School Program

The short visit made to the W. P. Wagner Vocational High School Program provided an opportunity to see the program in operation and speak briefly with one of the interpreters and students. The half-time program provides comprehensive work preparation for the students in their final years at school. The wide range of programs and the opportunity to experience working in different fields is invaluable and realistically cannot be offered by a school for the deaf with a relatively small number of students and limited facilities. The concept of integrating with a public school wherever appropriate is to be commended and the program at Wagner, with the appropriate support services, is a good example of co-operation between the Public School Board and the School for the Deaf.

The role of interpreters in a secondary school program needs to be carefully considered. Students at this level require help over and above the mere interpreting of lessons. The interpreters at Wagner appear to be responsible for tutoring students as necessary, dealing with minor discipline problems and reporting major ones to Alberta School for the Deaf staff, keeping attendance records for Alberta School for the Deaf and several other tasks besides their interpreting functions. A greal deal of co-ordination of such personnel is required, and an appropriate classification such as that of "Interpreter-Tutor" needs to be established if such programs with the necessary support services are to continue and expand. The practice of hiring staff on an hourly basis to carry out such responsible

duties could well stand review.

3. COMMUNICATION

The School follows the total communication approach to teaching deaf children. For the most part I was impressed with the overall willingness and ability of students to communicate and with the teachers' skills in signing.

I have already expressed some concerns in teaching speech and listening skills, and feel more emphasis could be placed on these aspects of total communication.

Despite a recent directive from the Minister of Education that an English-based signing system would be used throughout the School, I did not find a consistent policy setting out which of the several manually coded English systems should be used. Teachers, while aware that they were to sign in English word order, were not provided with training in how to apply an English-based system nor were reference books available which clearly set out the syntactic rules of signing English. I strongly recommend that one English-based system be adopted and all staff instructed in its use. While I do not disapprove of the use of American Sign Language (A.S.L.) vocabulary in an English-based system the grammatical rules, word endings, etc. must be common throughout the School and hopefully throughout the Province of Alberta.

There is need for ongoing staff discussion about the communication policy within the School. While most teachers were making every effort to sign in manually coded English and obtaining a great deal of success, a few staff members felt uneasy with the new policy and the way it was brought into the School.

While I personally support the use of an English-based signing system for instructional purposes, I do not believe that we should ignore the value of A.S.L. After all, most of the students at the Alberta School for the Deaf or at any other school for the deaf for that matter, will utilize A.S.L. for a great deal of their adult communication. Hence, there should be some opportunity for senior students to learn the theory and practice of A.S.L. Such opportunity might be incorporated in a "Deaf Studies" curriculum or a communications class, but students should be able to understand and respect A.S.L. as a language in its own right and use it

when needed. Whereas English-based systems are the most efficient for learning most classroom subjects, particularly the reading and writing of English, A.S.L. can be equally if not more efficient in areas such as counselling, drama and the arts.

4. RESIDENTIAL PROGRAM

The Residential Program at the Alberta School for the Deaf is divided into three major categories: 1) The Dormitory Program; 2) The On-Campus Housing Program; 3) The Off-Campus Living Program. All programs are presently under the direction of the Assistant Dean who is serving as Acting Dean. Houseparents are responsible for planning and supervision in the dormitories and on-campus houses, while the School Social Worker assists students on the off-campus program. Staff work nine hour shifts as follows: 11:30 A.M. - 8:30 P.M.; 2:30 P.M. - 11:30 P.M. and 11:30 P.M. - 8:30 A.M. Staff in the on-campus housing program work the 2:30 P.M. - 11:30 P.M. and 11:30 P.M. - 8:30 P.M. shifts only. Most permanent staff have weekends off and "wages" or casual employees are hired to supervise students at these times. The school has an excellent policy of regular home contact. Students who live within reasonable travelling distances go home each weekend, and all students are given the chance to live away from the school every second weekend when the residence is closed. Those children who are able, go home at this time, while those for whom time and distance preclude such weekend trips home spend the weekend in a foster or boarding home. Houseparents have frequent phone contact with parents though they would appreciate more feedback from the home. Although there is no specific pre-training required for houseparents at the School, those applicants with child care, nursing or other training and/or experience working with children are preferred. Because new house-parent staff often have little or no experience working with the deaf, a comprehensive orientation and ongoing in-service training program is required, and should be implemented as soon as possible. Such in-service should include courses in communication skills, child management, psychology of deafness, first aid training, arts and crafts activities, recreational therapy, etc.

Communications between the school and the residence should also be increased. While it was reported that house-parents visited the classrooms on a monthly basis, the same customs of teachers visiting the residences

or of scheduled meetings being held between school and residence staff were not apparent. Of particular importance is the development of a consistent communications philosophy throughout the school. While manually coded English is being used in the classroom, there appeared to be little carry over of this approach in the residences, and house-parents need frequent and regular instruction in the signing skills required for the total communication approach.

4.1 Dormitory Program

In general, the dormitories are well equipped and staff provide the usual variety of activities including sports and recreation, cubs, scouts and guides, cooking, sewing and many life-skills and social functions. The biggest obstacle to establishing a truly home-like atmosphere in the dormitories is the physical layout of the facilities. The present set up allows the students little privacy, with washroom facilities that are very institutional in design and especially inappropriate for the older boys. The recent decision to close the senior boys dormitory and move these students into a dormitory designed for juniors is proving to be most unpopular with students and staff. It is certainly hoped that the accommodation will be temporary or substantial renovations will be required in the very near future.

The excellent staff to student ratio of 1:6 is to be commended, as house-parents have ample opportunity to provide the individual attention each student requires and break down the unpopular aspects of group living. With this in mind I would recommend that greater attention could be paid to the individual student and suggest that with careful program planning and counselling, many of the discipline problems discussed during house-parent and student interviews could be alleviated.

4.2 The On-Campus Housing Program

Many schools for the Deaf would rightly be envious of the on-campus housing facilities for senior resident students at the school. The three houses are very well furnished and the staff and students working together provide a home-like atmosphere. Students are taught responsibility, learn to work together and experience many of the life skills needed by the well-adjusted adult. The sense of pride in the home and its program has reduced many of the discipline problems experienced by the same students when they were in the dormitory. The success of this program will

hopefully lead to its expansion and confirm that cottage style living is preferable to dormitory accommodation. A bouquet must be given to all staff and students involved in the program, and my only regret is that the program is not available to students who have to stay on campus during weekends.

4.3 The Off-Campus Living Program

When resident students turn 18 they are supported to live off campus in suites or boarding accommodation. This program, co-ordinated by the School Social Worker, is funded by the school. Each student receives a daily living allowance paid twice a week. This allowance is intended to cover costs of board and room and the students are helped with budgeting and handling their finances. The program is to be commended as it can provide that final step before independent adult living. Students are encouraged to look after themselves but support is available when needed. The success of the program is closely linked to the controls held by the school in that if basic rules are broken or the student's school attendance or punctuality suffer, the living allowance can be withheld on a daily basis. When a student is unable or unwilling to co-operate with the program, he or she can be moved back to one of the apartments available within the school. In this way, the program is well planned with built in controls while giving the student the opportunity to develop those skills necessary to live on his/her own away from the school.

5. SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS - FUTURE DIRECTIONS

5.1 Teacher Qualifications

It is recommended that the Province of Alberta establish qualifications for teachers of the hearing-impaired. Such specialist training should be over and above the basic teacher training required for purposes of certification and should meet or better the standards established by the Association of Canadian Educators of the Hearing Impaired. The University of Alberta now offers a graduate program in education of the deaf which would meet the above standards. It is not appropriate to expect teachers to carry out the specialist tasks of teaching language and communication to deaf children without the necessary training at the Graduate Level. Hearing-Impaired children attending the Alberta School for the Deaf as well as those attending School Board Programs have the right to quality education and this should be provided by skilled and trained personnel.

5.2 Administration

It is recommended that the Administrative Structure of the school be reviewed in order to clarify areas of overlap or redundancy. Careful attention should be paid to the positions of Superintendent, Principal, Vice-Principal, Teacher-Seniors, Dean and Assistant Dean of Residence.

5.3 The Instructional Program

Several major recommendations have been made in this area:

5.3.1 That teachers be responsible for teaching language, speech and listening skills to their students. Support personnel, such as speech therapists, audiologists, resource teachers and the occupational therapist should support the teacher where necessary.

5.3.2 That teachers meet to determine how best to adapt Alberta Curriculum materials to the specific needs of the deaf students in the School. Particular attention must be paid to the Language Arts Curriculum.

5.3.3 That a Language curriculum designed specifically for hearing-impaired children which clearly sets out the hierarchy of language skills to be mastered be adopted throughout the school.

5.3.4 That an integrated approach to learning be developed with less teacher specialization in the early years.

5.3.5 That the practice and procedures for assigning junior children to basic and general level classes be reviewed.

5.3.6 That an ongoing diagnostic evaluation program be developed as a basis for individual programming.

5.3.7 That one English-based signing system be chosen and implemented consistently throughout the school. All teachers must have ready access to reference materials on the chosen system.

5.3.8 That speech and listening skills receive more attention in the senior school.

5.3.9 That teachers work together to provide consistent programming throughout the school, and through this team approach to overcome the departmental divisions that have developed.

5.4 Teacher Evaluation

It is recommended that the system of teacher evaluation be reviewed. A

process that involves self-evaluation as well as the Principal's evaluation might be considered. Frequent interviews and classroom visits could allow staff to view the evaluation process more positively.

5.5 Residential Program

Major recommendations concerning the residence are as follows:

5.5.1 That the physical facilities of the dormitories be improved to meet the changing needs of the students.

5.5.2 That an ongoing inservice program be established for houseparents, especially in the areas of communication skills with the deaf, child management and psychology of deafness.

5.5.3 That the present on-campus housing program be expanded as a model for future residential programming.

6. CONCLUSION

The Alberta School for the Deaf is offering a comprehensive educational and life-skills program for the deaf children it serves. The school is well equipped and adequately staffed. Although some teachers require further training in education of the deaf, there is a genuine effort on behalf of all staff to provide the best program for the students at the school. Teachers appeared under considerable pressure due to the recent parental concerns and the subsequent evaluation process. While improvements can be made in student evaluation, curriculum implementation, and particular teaching strategies that apply to teaching deaf children, there are many good programs in place at the school and the standards are comparable to other schools for the deaf across Canada. Communication between teachers and students and among the students themselves was of a high standard. The senior students' ability to answer questions and discuss their school with the evaluators was exceptionally good and displayed a mature attitude not always seen among deaf students.

The key to the future success of the school lies with a well trained staff working together with the administration to provide an up to date program designed to meet the specific needs of the hearing impaired while maintaining the high standards set by Alberta Education. Positive feedback from all areas should encourage staff to use their talents confidently and do much to help the school move forward.

Respectfully submitted - John L. Anderson

APPENDIX 2

ALBERTA SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF EVALUATION

Report by

M. Bernice Ryan, Principal, Teacher Education Centre
Sir James Whitney School, Belleville, Ontario

INTRODUCTION

A comprehensive external evaluation of the Alberta School for the Deaf was initiated to provide summary information for use by decision-makers. The team of out-of-province evaluators who specialize in the education of the deaf consisted of three members:

1. Mr. John Anderson, Principal, Saskatchewan School for the Deaf, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.
2. Mr. Marshall Wick, Professor, Gallaudet College, Washington, D.C.
3. Mrs. Bernice Ryan, Principal, Teacher Education Centre, Sr. James Whitney School, Belleville, Ontario.

In the contract with the Minister of Education, Department of Education, Province of Alberta, the team was directed to undertake and complete the following activities:

1. Attending an orientation meeting with the Principal External Evaluators and contributing to decisions about areas of focus;
2. Collecting data by observing in classrooms, interviewing staff and students and reviewing documents and materials;
3. Sharing and discussing observations and conclusions with other evaluators.
4. Developing inferences, conclusions, recommendations and commendations;
5. Reporting (verbally) the highlights of (4) to ASD staff at a debriefing meeting;
6. Securing feedback from ASD at the de-briefing meeting; and
7. Preparing a written report which will provide description and judgments about the aspects of the programmes selected for evaluation. The report will include inferences, conclusions, commendations and recommendations.

In addition, in their correspondence dated November 23, 1982, Dr. S. C. T. Clarke and Dr. V. R. Nyberg recommended that the evaluators give particular attention to:

1. the standards of achievement in language;
2. methods of teaching, especially the use of English in communication between students and teachers;
3. dormitory arrangements and group living;
4. specific suggestions for improving the school;
5. future directions the school should take.

It was decided that individual written reports should be submitted since there was not time to prepare a comprehensive group report by the team following the on-site investigation.

Procedures

In attempting to assess the Alberta School for the Deaf, members of the team were assigned group and individual tasks by Dr. Clarke and Dr. Nyberg.

The opening session on Sunday evening, December 5th, included an orientation to the evaluation by Dr. Rhodes, Dr. Clarke and Dr. Nyberg.

Monday morning, following an introduction to the evaluation and a discussion concerning procedures, the evaluators were given an overview of the school organization and programmes by the Superintendent, the Principal, the Vice-Principal and the Teacher Seniors.

The evaluators completed in-class observations according to an assigned schedule on Monday afternoon, Tuesday and Wednesday. Interspersed with the observations were conferences with each of the teachers observed.

Each of the evaluators had a special assignment on Thursday December 9th. These included student interviews, Dr. Clarke and Mr. Wick; residences, Mr. Anderson; support and ancillary services, Mrs. Ryan.

Friday morning sessions included perception sharing with the investigators and the administration. In the afternoon each evaluator presented an overview of his/her perceptions and recommendations for interested staff.

ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

Although the team was not required to do an in depth investigation of the administrative structure of the school, it is essential to comment on the structure as it is a basic and ultimately a key component in any school programme.

The Alberta School for the Deaf is organized under a Superintendent as its head. The Superintendent has the responsibility for the total school programme making certain that the directives outlined by the Ministry are followed.

The Principal has the chief responsibility of evaluating the teachers in the school as well as assisting the Superintendent in a wide variety of duties.

The Vice-Principal, who reports directly to the Superintendent, has

responsibility for supervising the Support Services Personnel which include the nurses, speech therapists, the audiologist, the guidance counsellor, the audiovisual technician, the hearing aid technician, the part-time librarian, and the occupational therapist. In addition, the incumbent has responsibility for the language, speech and auditory training programmes. Also, the incumbent has, during the present year, been acting psychologist because the school does not have a psychologist on staff at present.

The Teacher Seniors have a variety of responsibilities including classroom teaching or individual or small group tutorial, general supervision of the programme of the primary, intermediate-senior, or pre-vocational programmes. Each of the Teacher Seniors co-ordinates a subject area across all school departments. The Teacher Senior of primary department co-ordinates math, the intermediate-senior Teacher Senior co-ordinates science and the pre-vocational Teacher Senior co-ordinates the health, living and vocational skills curriculum.

The school programme is organized in three departments, the primary, the intermediate-senior and the pre-vocational department.

A levels system is used in the organization of class groups. Classes designed G are deemed to have good academic potential; those designated as B have less academic skill and classes designated as M have the lowest level of skill and have the most modification in programme.

Comments

The nature of the administrative structure of the school poses some problems. The Principal of the school has the responsibility of evaluating teachers but does not appear to have direct responsibility for the programmes that are delivered. The Vice-Principal who has charge of the unique and specialized areas, language, speech and auditory training, reports directly to the Superintendent.

The Teacher Seniors, particularly in the primary and intermediate-senior divisions, have wide ranging responsibilities, where it would seem that they would be more effective if they concentrated their energies on a particular department.

Although the present arrangement may seem to provide for co-ordination in subject areas from kindergarten to the conclusion of secondary school, it

is unlikely that an individual who is a specialist at the primary level would have equal expertise at the secondary level; the converse is also true.

Recommendations

The person who is in charge of the school, whether the position is designated as the Superintendent or not, should be responsible for the total operation of the school.

The Principal or Vice-Principal, who reports directly to the Superintendent, should have full responsibility for the academic programme. The incumbent must be knowledgeable in deaf education with all of the ramifications. He/she must have an in depth knowledge of language development and the teaching of language to deaf students, the teaching of speech and use of residual hearing, including auditory training.

The teachers should report to one person whomever that person might be. The present system of having teachers reporting to various individuals about different subjects gives the teachers a feeling of insecurity and a feeling that they are getting opposing messages from different supervisors.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMME OVERVIEW

Aims and Objectives

The administration reported to the evaluators that the aims and objectives of the Alberta School for the Deaf were essentially those laid down by the Ministry of Education, Province of Alberta as outlined in the circular from the Ministry The Goals of Basic Education for Alberta 1978, 05 15. The ultimate goal is to help every deaf child develop into a self-supporting citizen of the province and a socially and vocationally adequate individual.

Currciulum

As of September, 1982, the curriculum outlined for the regular schools of the Province of Alberta has been adopted for use in the Alberta School for the Deaf.

The Hearing Impaired Curriculum Guide, Alberta Education, 1981 Copy is used in the speech, auditory training and living vocational area.

Comments

Teachers are attempting to teach the content of the academic programmes

in subjects such as math, science, and social studies (history and geography) without sufficient attention to the language capabilities of the children whom they are teaching.

The use of topics as outlined in the Alberta School curriculum meets the needs of the students' cognitive and maturational development. They are not, however, being adapted to meet the needs of the studerts' development in language. The teachers are attempting to give the students some information of all of the topics in the curriculum. As a result, the students are receiving a global awareness of a vast number of topics, particularly in science and social studies, but the students do not have sufficient facility with language of the subjects to manipulate the concepts and discuss them using the English language.

TEACHING PROGRAMME

The following is a description of the organization and structure of the educational programme as I observed and understood it.

JUNIOR DEPARTMENT

The fifty-seven children in the Junior Department are organized into twelve classes -- three beginners classes, two general classes, six basic classes and one special class.

A Teacher Senior is responsible for the general supervision of the Junior programme.

The teachers are responsible for teaching language, reading and other school subjects to the children in their classes. Some classes are reorganized for specific subjects, particularly mathematics. Classroom teachers do not have responsibility for teaching, nor practicing specific speech skills nor for the specific development of listening skills. The children are withdrawn on an individual basis for speech instruction. As far as I could ascertain, the development of precise listening skills is not a part of any programme.

Children are also withdrawn from the classrooms as individuals or in small groups for therapy in motor development, language, mathematics and reading.

The curriculum being followed in all school subjects, including reading, is that outlined in the Alberta School Curriculum Guides.

The language programmes are developed from the Curriculum outlined in

Sentences and Other Systems.

In three of the classes that I observed in the Junior Department the children were using group amplification systems and the teachers were wearing radio transmitters. These teachers used appropriate microphone techniques and used their voices in all communication with the children. In the fourth classroom, some of the children were wearing individual hearing aids. The teacher mouthed all of her utterances in her discussions with the children but I did not hear her vocalize throughout the lesson.

All of the teachers were using some signed English although no particular signing system was being used by all teachers. In most instances, however, the syntax used followed correct English and the inflections were usually spelled.

The children in one class were constantly urged to expand on brief one word utterances, and in two other classes the teacher made expansions for the children in spoken and signed English.

The blackboard was used very little. Although the lessons that I observed did not lend themselves to cumulative blackboard reinforcement, I believe that the blackboard is not used sufficiently on a regular basis. There was limited blackboard space that was not covered, in many classrooms.

The teachers all had long term plans for the classes. In most cases, the plans were copied from the curriculum guides without branching details.

The daily plans were also prepared. There was, however, a lack of detail and cohesion in the plans.

I concluded following the conferences with the teachers (I was unable to meet with one teacher because of conflict in the schedule) that the teachers had insufficient information to prepare more comprehensive and detailed plans particularly in language. Two of the teachers had transferred into the Junior Department from other teaching assignments within the school and had received little or no in-service training before they began their present assignments. They did not receive detailed descriptions of the present level of functioning of each child when they received their classes in September. Without such information, it is almost impossible to design an appropriate programme for each child.

I am not at all sure that the teachers whom I observed have sufficient

training in language development and the strategies that must be used to teach language to deaf children, to design, and deliver a language programme for individual deaf children without intensive ongoing guidance and instruction.

Most of the children whom I observed in the Junior Department are at the basic language learning stage. They are not, for that reason, able to read materials which are prepared for children of a comparable age. On the other hand, as Blackwell and others have stated, literature must be introduced at a young age and spiralled into an overall curriculum. The most productive way for teachers to ensure that children are introduced to cognitively appropriate stories is through storytelling by the teacher, and by rewriting stories using appropriate syntax and vocabulary. The teacher can use the rewritten materials to develop the mechanical skills as well as teaching them to use reading as a means of thinking and experiencing.

The teachers in the Junior Department seem to be able to select appropriate topics from the Alberta School Curriculum in other school subjects. The topics are dealt with by action and experimentation and through iconic representation through pictures and diagrams. Language development could be enhanced by the teacher attaching written language to children's thoughts which are represented in signs and pictures.

Recommendations

1. That the language programme be reassessed with particular emphasis on the written form of language including the recording of formal conversation.
2. That every child in the Junior Department be given a thorough language assessment. I would recommend the use of
   a) the GAEL Tests - A, Simple Sentence Level or B, Complex Sentence Level (whichever is appropriate).
   b) a language sample be taken to determine the child's use of the English language to express his ideas.

   The GAEL tests provide normative data concerning the development of syntax.

   The language sample provides a basis for programming in the semantic (including lexical) syntactic and pragmatic domains.
3. That the teachers prepare individual language goals for each child in his/her class.

4. That the children be objectively tested to ascertain if they are reaching the goals as outlined.
5. That teachers make greater use of the blackboard to be certain that the children are receiving the complete sentence including all of the functors and inflections. The children would also have referents available throughout the lesson.
6. That the teachers continue to use topics in science, social studies and health outlined in the Alberta School Curriculum. The teachers make detailed long term plans in each of the subjects listing the detail to be included, in particular, the vocabulary and concepts to be learned.
7. That the teachers test the students objectively on their knowledge of the content and vocabulary, both expressive and receptive.
8. That the teachers list the specific goals in mathematics under concepts, computation and the ability to understand and solve written problems.
9. That the teachers use age appropriate rewritten story books for reading material.

Teaching of Speech and Auditory Training

I have separated the teaching of speech in the Junior School from the rest of the report because I did not observe speech teaching nor correction in any of the classrooms in which I observed. Children were reminded in most classes to use their voices.

The details of the method of teaching speech will be discussed under ancillary services; however, it seems appropriate to comment on the method of delivery with the discussion on the Junior School programme.

The Hearing Impaired Curriculum Guide states that the programme outlined in Speech and the Hearing-Impaired Child: Theory and Practice (Ling 1976) is used as the speech curriculum. There is little evidence that the curriculum is being followed as it is laid down because of some basic differences in the delivery system.

Dr. Ling states that the class teacher should be the person principally responsible for the teaching of speech. To follow the programme the teacher should allocate blocks of time of two or three minutes duration to the teaching of speech, four or five times a day rather than longer lessons. He also states that if additional speech lessons are given by

another person such as a speech therapist, the teacher must be certain that these additional lessons are congruent with her goals for the child. Ling concurs with others in this respect. If speech teaching is delegated to someone other than the class teacher, speech production tends to become less relevant and less functional.

The Ling approach to teaching speech demands that each child make the utmost use of residual hearing.

It is recognized that a number of teachers at the Alberta School for the Deaf may feel inadequate in the teaching of speech and until all of the teachers are thoroughly trained alternate arrangements must be made. It is also recognized that alternate arrangements must be made for children who are being taught by deaf teachers.

Auditory training is an integral part of the speech programme not a separate subject. In the development of each subskill the child is expected, within the limits of his capacity to hear, to auditorilly discriminate sounds produced by others and himself, and to identify patterns when produced by others.

Recommendations

1. Teachers who have had adequate pre-service training as teachers of the deaf should be responsible for the teaching of speech and auditory training in their own classes. These teachers should have access to assistance from speech therapists for help with specific problems.
2. The speech therapists should do the speech teaching in the classrooms of teachers who do not have sufficient speech teaching skills. The therapists should demonstrate specific speech tasks to be undertaken throughout the day.
3. That auditory training be integrated into the speech programme. To help the teacher to determine if the child is achieving the level that should be expected every teacher should have in her file recent aided and unaided audiograms for each child in her class.
4. That teachers and children be expected to use voicing as part of the total communication approach.

General Overview of the Junior Department Programme

The classroom teacher should have responsibility for the total programme of each child in her class. The classes are small enough to allow for

individualized instruction by the teacher in problem areas. It is recognized that there are particular areas in which a teacher cannot be expected to have expertise, such as occupational therapy and the child needs to have the benefit of expert, skilled training but in other educational difficulties it is recommended that the teacher seek guidance from an expert in a particular area but carry out the developmental or remedial procedures for her own class.

INTERMEDIATE DEPARTMENT

The children aged thirteen to fifteen are in the Intermediate Department of the school. There are three streams, General, Basic and Modified in three levels, seven to nine.

The classes operate on a rotary system under the general supervision of a Teacher Senior who also has responsibility for the academic programme in the Senior Department. Each teacher in the Intermediate Department teaches one or more subjects.

The Alberta School Curriculum for grades six to nine is used for all school subjects.

I observed five classes in the Intermediate Department. The students were having lessons in Language Arts, science, mathematics or home economics.

The teachers in each of the classes were using manually coded English for instruction. Two of the deaf teachers used spoken English throughout their lessons, the third mouthed the English and was easy to lipread, but did not vocalize during the lesson.

I observed that less than half of the students were wearing hearing aids. In schools for the deaf, students frequently cease to wear hearing aids if they have not received intensive auditory training. The obvious reason for this is that the students are not able to receive much help from their hearing aids because they do not know how to use their residual hearing.

A second, but less important fact in my opinion, is that adolescents tend to reject hearing aids when they begin to exert their own authority. This happens in only a limited number of instances where children have received ample appropriate training in the use of residual hearing.

It was difficult to assess the student's functional level of language in the classes that I observed. However, I did note that most of the

students used sentence fragments rather than full sentences in their responses to the teachers. The teachers seldom, if ever, required the children to expand the fragments into sentences. Without this constant use of sentences, deaf children seldom acquire full mastery of the syntax of English.

In order to have a better understanding of the students' functional language level, I asked for and received samples of the students' uncorrected written compositions. The work of the students in the G level class was comparable to that which would be expected of deaf children of that age and grade. There were typical errors in syntax particularly in the use of complex sentences. These problems could be eliminated through careful teaching of each of the complex sentence structures.

In the specific programme objectives on page nine of the Special Education Program of Studies (draft copy) Alberta, 1982, it is clearly stated that "programs should provide evidence of integrating language teaching in all classroom activities." The teachers, however, seem to be having a difficult time in reconciling the amount of content that they feel they must teach, with the language needs of the children whom they are teaching. They are covering a very wide range of content materials and the students are grasping the concepts but are not having sufficient practice with the language related to each of the topics to be able to use language to discuss the topics nor, to read about them in the future.

It is difficult in a rotary system to deal with the language component of the subjects at an adequate level. The teacher must be fully aware of each child's level of language functioning and develop ever higher levels of structure and use these structures in each school subject.

The papers written by students in the G level classes were quite different. Each of the stories revealed a clear understanding of the meaning of story telling. There were, however, so many errors in English that I could see little purpose in having the students write them.

The errors were of two types. The first type was simply a lack of knowledge of sentence structure. The second, which is typical of this type of student, showed evidence of a cognitive linguistic imbalance in the student's work. The students understood the relationship between a number of ideas but did not have the complex linguistic structures necessary to

express their ideas.

The General class that I observed in Language Arts was discussing an advanced literary work and was handling the material exceptionally well. They were capable of making inferences and drawing conclusions and were carrying on a high level discussion about the material.

The mathematics class was learning a new mechanical skill and made excellent progress throughout the lesson.

One problem that arose in two of the classes was that children left for tutorial work in speech at crucial times during the presentation of material.

The teachers all had long and short term plans for each of their classes. The learning outcomes were not, however, as clearly articulated as they should be.

Recommendations

1. That consideration be given to using only a modified rotary system for Basic and Modified classes at the Intermediate levels. This would encourage a more integrated approach to the development of language skills.
2. That teachers be equally aware of the development of cognition, content and language in all areas of the curriculum.
3. That the language curriculum which is currently being used be carefully examined to make certain that it is meeting the needs of the students.
4. That long term plans and short term plans for individual students be written more precisely, particularly for students in the Basic and Modified streams.
5. That the students at least in the General and Basic levels of the Intermediate Department be given individual language assessments.
    1) The Grammatical Analysis of Elicited Language Complex Sentence Level (GAEL-C)
    2) Language samples to determine the functional use of language. Language sampling would actually benefit all students.
6. That individual language goals be determined for each child based on the language assessments.
7. That a regular and objective method of functional language assessment become a part of the regular ongoing programme.
8. That the methods of teaching language be examined to be certain that

the methods being used are concomitant with the newer approaches to teaching language to deaf children. I would suggest that the use of interactive language should be emphasized in teaching language.

As in the discussions of the Junior Department Programme, I have separated the teaching of speech and auditory training from the general discussion as these subjects are not taught in the regular school programme.

The students are withdrawn from the programme for speech and are given speech lessons by a speech therapist. If I understood correctly, all of the students do not receive speech therapy as there is not sufficient time.

My comments and recommendations about speech teaching in the Junior Department would also apply for the Intermediate Department.

SENIOR DEPARTMENT

My comments on the Senior Department are limited as I observed only one senior academic class and two vocational classes. I did not observe any of the Pre-Vocational Classes nor did I become familiar with that programme.

The Senior Department is organized on a rotary system as is usual in high school classes where teachers need more specialized skills because of the nature of the work.

The senior social studies class that I observed was following the Alberta School Curriculum for Grade 10. The students had obvious mastery of the concepts being discussed with the normal difficulty that deaf students experience with subjects that contain so much difficult vocabulary.

The shop classes that I observed were well organized. The students had assigned tasks which they were carrying out diligently.

The teachers expressed concern about teaching the shop language adequately because of the wide range of language abilities in the groups that were in the shop at the same time. This is a normal problem in a small programme. Shop teachers need specific assistance in developing language and reading within their own subject areas.

The problem might be further ameliorated by more interaction between the language teachers in the academic programme and the teachers in the shop programme.

SUPPORT AND ANCILLARY SERVICES

The school is well staffed with a wide range of highly qualified support personnel. Because of a previous commitment by the Vice-Principal I was unable to meet with her to get an overall picture of the operation prior to individual conferences. It was unfortunate that telephone interviews had to be scheduled on that particular day.

Audiological Services

The clinic is staffed by a well qualified audiologist who has recently commenced work at the school. She has just begun to do routine audiological assessments because the equipment has been out of order. She has very effective plans for updating testing and then giving teachers assistance and direction in the use of amplification.

The hearing aid technician keeps the group and individual aids in good working order. There is an adequate supply of loaner aids for use when regular equipment is being repaired.

Speech Therapy

I observed two of the three speech therapists working with students. Both therapists are well qualified in their work. They have not, however, had specific training nor practicum in the teaching of speech to deaf children. They would benefit from attendance at one of Dr. Ling's short courses in teaching speech to deaf children. This is particularly important if the Ling approach to teaching speech is the one which is being used in Alberta. It is a widely accepted approach and is the best, in my opinion, if it is properly used.

The speech therapist who works in the Senior Department expressed concern about the lack of progress in her clients. I would suggest that she must have the co-operation if teachers and parents of the students live at home in giving daily practice in specific speech skills if any real improvement is to be expected.

The therapists routinely assess the speech production of the students whom they see and chart their progress.

I have serious reservations, which have been elaborated upon previously, about the delivery system in speech training.

Occupational Therapy

The students at the Alberta School for the Deaf who have special difficulties are most fortunate to have the services of a knowledgeable occupational therapist. I was most impressed by the work that I saw in the area of motor training.

Library

The library is exceptionally well supplied with books, films and filmstrips. The librarian (part-time) concentrates her time on the physical management of the facility. She has little time for teaching library skills. This aspect of the programme is left to the individual teachers.

I did not find a specific organized curriculum for teaching library skills including research skills.

Senior students reported to Dr. Clarke that they did not use the library extensively. They particularly did not enjoy fiction. A concentrated effort should be made to help children read library books. Rewriting fiction at the Junior level and highlighting fiction at the Intermediate level to help them cope with the complicated syntax might encourage the reading habit.

Guidance

I observed the guidance counsellor teaching a class and discussed the services offered with him.

The class was following a standard programme which the teacher had adapted linguistically. The students were able to discuss the concepts being presented.

The guidance counsellor appears to keep abreast with the current opportunities for deaf students and was able to clearly define how he was trying to help individual students become aware of the various options that were open to them and the preparation they would need to make to reach their goals.

Although the guidance counsellor is deaf, I had no difficulty communicating with him with very limited use of manual communication. He lipreads well and with a little effort and practice can be understood. He makes a great effort to make certain that he understands what is said and that he is understood.

If parents of students have difficulty talking to the guidance counsellor, it might be helpful if they were given some technique to use during their conversations with him.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The teaching staff at the school appeared to be a concerned group of professionals who were anxious and willing to co-operate with the evaluators. They regularly expressed the hope that the evaluation of the school would help to give some new directions which would enhance the educational opportunities of deaf children.

There was a warm relationship between the students and staff whom I observed.

One of the most serious problems to me at least, is that a number of the staff have not had adequate pre-service training in deaf education. A minimum of one continuous year of intensive academic study with concurrent practice application is essential to become a competent teacher of deaf children.

The current practice of hiring teachers without full training in deaf education and giving them in-service training in particular areas does not provide sufficient knowledge of language development and methods of teaching language, accoustics of speech and methods of teaching speech, and the development of listening skills.

The teachers are attempting to use manually coded English. I would recommend that one of the accepted methods of using signed English be adopted and that teachers receive regular, weekly in-service training in the use of the chosen system.

All of the students whom I observed in the classes, in the halls and in the dining room were well mannered and socially competent.

There seems to be some lack of communication between various groups in different departments of the school. Much of the confusion seems to be related to lack of understanding as to how the Alberta School Curriculum should be applied in the school programme. In-service training with input from the teachers should help to clarify this problem.

The school is offering an extensive programme of studies for deaf students.

It is important to have a sufficient number of students to be able to group students according to cognitive and linguistic ability. At the present time the Alberta School for the Deaf has an enrolment large enough to allow for appropriate class groupings. It is rarely possible for profoundly deaf children to receive an appropriate education where the numbers of deaf children do not allow for appropriate grouping.

The Alberta School for the Deaf supplies a much needed service.

I would be pleased to answer any questions in clarification of any aspects of my observations or recommendations contained in this report or on any matters concerning the education of the hearing impaired in which I may be able to be of help.

Respectfully submitted,

"M. Bernice Ryan"

APPENDIX 3

ALBERTA SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF EVALUATION

report by

E. Marshall Wick, JD, Associate Professor
Gallaudet College, Washington, D.C.

INTRODUCTION

The comments, inferences, conclusions and recommendations in this Report are based on information and feedback obtained through a wide variety of sources including:

a) formal (structured, scheduled) on-site 40 minute observations of 13 classes and informal (unstructured, unscheduled) 15 minute observations of 2 additional classes.

b) formal conference interviews with 9 of those observed (for periods ranging from 20 to 45 minutes).

c) formal 30 minute interviews with a random sample of 8 senior students.

d) formal briefings by the administration with the Principal Evaluators and informal discussions with these personnel.

e) a formal debriefing session with informal discussion following this session with some of the administrators and some of those teachers observed and interviewed.

f) printed materials related to the school (brochures, Superintendent's Report, Long Range Plan document), Department of Education Act Regulations and Goals of Basic Education, Hearing Impaired Curriculum Guide, Advisory Board Minutes, Learning Centre Evaluation Report and a Report on Teacher Qualifications.

g) separate informal meetings with 3 parents of deaf children and two interpreters who do regular assignments for the school.

h) a meeting with the officers of the Alberta Association of the Deaf and two other informal meetings with leaders from the Edmonton deaf Community.

i) an informal visit to W.P. Wagner Vocational High School, an informal visit to the junior dormitory and informal visits and discussions with the school librarian and audiologist.

j) informal interaction with other members of the External Specialists team and the Alberta Education specialists. Evaluations measure actual performance against some predetermined expected performance. The Alberta School for the Deaf (ASD) could be evaluated on how well it is performing as compared with:

1) regular elementary and secondary schools in Alberta.
2) special education schools or classes in Alberta.
3) other similar residential schools for the deaf or
4) the school's own stated goals or expectations.

While some consideration must be given to comparisons to all of the first three categories, none of them is appropriate as a general base for comparison -- the first two serve vastly different student populations and, in the absence of extensive, reliable comparative data on the third category, any comparison is highly subjective. This report focuses on the fourth category. However, it assumes that all those involved with educating the students at the ASD are familiar with and have adopted the Alberta government "Goals of Basic Education in Alberta" and have incorporated these goals into their own. It also assumes that those involved at ASD in the direct instruction of deaf children are professionally aware of trends in education of deaf children in Canada and have a general idea of what is happening in other schools for the deaf and thus able to make some comparisons of their own when developing their teaching strategy and evaluating their achievements. Although the means of achieving Alberta Education goals may be different and, indeed, the means of measuring whether these goals have been achieved may be vastly different (due to the communication differences and limitations of deaf students expressing themselves in the English language), the end products of the ASD should be <u>overally</u> comparable to similar products (matched as to performance IQ, socio-economic background, etc.) of the public and special education schools. Second, by utilizing external specialists, in addition to internal specialists, it is presumed that some general comparison with other programs for the deaf is desirable if not expected but that by utilizing a team with different professional backgrounds (a teacher trainer, an administrator and a deaf education of the products of many schools for the deaf) any overall comparison will be broadly based.

This report is mainly concerned with an evaluation of the academic program (including integral support services) and to a lesser degree relationships between the academic program personnel and the administration. Residential life programs were not evaluated due to time limitations but this aspect of the school was covered by other evaluators. It should be noted here, however, that this is an important part of the overall evaluation of a school such as the ASD and if the evaluation did not cover this in depth

the relationship between the academic and residential program and the contribution of the latter to the former should be a serious part of future studies or evaluations.

SPECIFIC EVALUATION AREAS

I. Benefits of Attendance at ASD

Social and Personal Development

Comments: Social and personal development of students is directly related to the following Alberta Goals of Education:

--Acquire knowledge and develop skills, attitudes and habits which contribute to physical, mental and social well being.

--Develop an understanding of the meaning, responsibilities and benefits of active citizenship.

Observations: In general, the students appeared to be doing well in both social and personal development without the regimentation found in many residential schools. Those interviewed generally demonstrated an intellectual curiosity and the ability to get along with people of varying backgrounds, beliefs and lifestyles. Perhaps the opportunity to learn this is one of the strengths of a residential school program as compared to the relatively homogeneous composition of a neighbourhood public school. Evaluating this area is very subjective as one tends to project his own values into the evaluation criteria but it appears that the teachers and other staff have generally developed in the students a more positive self-esteem than in the typical school for the deaf. This may be partly due to the comparatively close contact between some of the staff and the parents and the fact that there are a large number of deaf role models on the staff.

Recommendations:

* The staff should be commended for this contribution to the growth of the students and encouraged to expand this by encouraging more desire for lifelong learning.
* The school should continuously strive to provide opportunities for interaction of residential students with the outside community.

Academic Endeavours

Comments: Deafness is a handicap of communication and thus success in academic endeavours is directly related to the ability of the students to

communicate with the teacher and to interact with their fellow students. Deaf students have a wide variety of hearing loss (or put in a positive manner, have a wide range of useable residual hearing), a wide range of attention spans and a wide range of speech reading skills. The most logical and practical means of reaching all of these students is to adopt what is referred to as a Total Communication approach which is not possible in a regular classroom and which is more difficult to fully implement in day classes. Properly implemented, a Total Communication approach does not merely permit manual communication as a means of communicating with deaf students but is an approach which utilizes any means of communication which at a specific time in a specific situation results in meaningful interaction between a child and his environment. Communication for deaf persons is basically visual in nature, not auditory as is true for those with a normal range of hearing or for those hard of hearing. The hearing child is bombarded with auditory input during all his waking hours--the deaf child should be likewise bombarded with visual input if we are to expect comparable educational progress. We would thus expect that the benefits of a child going to the ASD would be that the children and teachers would be able to fluently communicate with each other at a level commensurate with the child's academic development and that the teachers would make the learning experience much more visual in nature than would teachers in other schools. One of the basic goals of schooling in Alberta is 'developing competencies in reading, writing, speaking, listening and viewing'. One of the expected advantages of attendance at a school for the deaf is the specialized approach needed to develop skills in these areas since students do not acquire these skills in the same manner as hearing students do.

Observations: Although there did not appear to be any reward-punishment for acquiring/failing to acquire skills in the use of manual communication, in general the academic teaching staff was quite skilled in the use of both manually coded English (the primary sign system used in the classroom in agreement with the Department of Education policy) and American Sign Language and communication between the teachers and the students was 'normal' and a pleasure to observe. In general, the classrooms and materials used reflected the need for visual input and the only weakness observed as in the lack of, or improper use of overhead projectors. The school has an extensive

collection of captioned film strips and more current captioned educational films than all other schools for the deaf in Canada combined. In keeping with the visual nature of learning, the school and its parent association has a unique program to assist families in acquiring a device to allow deaf perons to use the telephone (a TDD) and another device to enjoy adapted television programs (a closed caption decoder). The extensive use of these devices over an extended period of time is bound to increase the reading and viewing skills of deaf students. All these activities indicate the benefits of attending a centralized school program such as ASD. In addition, the teachers at ASD can readily refer hearing and speech problems to supporting personnel for immediate attention, although this apparently is not done frequently.

Recommendations:

* The staff should be commended for developing the skills necessary to successfully implement a Total Communication environment. They should be encouraged to continue to upgrade these skills.
* The Alberta Government and the ASD should be commended for supporting an extensive captioned film and captioned film strips collection and the ASD for encouraging the acquisition of telecommunication and telecaption devices. The should should continue to exploit the latest technology, including utilization of microcomputers far beyond the current limited use for math drills.
* Telecaption decoders should be installed even in the junior dormitory recreation area for although there are not very many programs captioned specifically for very young deaf children, the children should be exposed to captioned television at a very early age in the same manner that hearing children are exposed to television programs they may not understand.
* The staff should be encouraged to develop further skills in the effective use of overhead projectors (production of appropriate transparencies, proper setup and lighting, etc.). This (and the effective use of other audio-visuals) might be an appropriate subject for a professional day activity.

Preparation for Employment

Comments: One of the basic goals of schooling in Alberta is

--Acquire knowledge and develop skills, attitudes and habits required to respond to the opportunities and expectations of the world of work.

Observations: Although there is no extensive vocational program available at the school itself, the school does have formal ties to vocational training programs in local secondary schools and provides support services to these schools, including interpreting the tutoring services. Evaluation of this activity was not included as a part of the specialists' schedule however and although it appears an important part of the overall program, there was little discussion by the teaching staff and there appeared to be an unfortunate psychological separation between the academic and prevocational staff who, for example, take their parallel breaks in separate lounges at present. Deaf students are relatively limited in their exposure to tasks hearing children acquire through normal family and peer discussions. Bank activities, purchases on credit, and the "living skills" program, which includes a course on the world of work taught by the Guidance Counsellor, appear excellent ways to meet this basic goal.

Recommendations:

* The Living Skills program should be further developed and every student given the opportunity to benefit from it.
* The school should be commended for establishing the group living homes to give students practical supervised experiences in living independently.
* Means should be found to bring the academic and prevocational staff in closer contact and cooperation with each other. The external vocational program for so-called half day students should be given greater visibility and consideration in future evaluations and should be considered an integral part of the total school program.

II. Instruction and Support Process

Student Needs, Individualized Education Plans

Comments: Each student has an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) designed for his/her development and each student's progress is supposed to be evaluated according to this plan. This plan should be developed in conjunction with the support service staff and, ideally, with input and participation from the parents to ensure their involvement in the implementation of the plan.

Observations: It was not possible in the short time frame available to determine whether the IEPs were being properly developed, implemented and revised but those asked to do so could produce such plans for the children they were responsible for. The concept behind the IEP appears to be excellent (each child is an individual with different needs at any given time) but putting it into practice is an entirely different matter. The teachers appear to have relatively frequent contact with parents (an an outstanding aspect is that deaf teachers can contact hearing parents and hearing teachers can contact deaf parents through the phone since both parties have a TDD available). This frequent contact is made possible by a province-wide toll free line. One of the more frequent complaints of the teachers was that they do not have adequate time to plan and implement all that has lately been expected of them. It was difficult to determine whether students were actually evaluated against the IEP rather than in the traditional subject matter grading. The other evaluators will probably be better qualified to comment on the validity and value of an IEP approach.

Recommendations:

* If the IEP approach is deemed appropriate then the staff should be given adequate time to prepare, modify and update such plans.
* A systematic means of passing standardized IEP records from teacher to teacher as the student progresses be devised and implemented.

Support Services

Comments: The provision of support services is critical to the success of a program for deaf students. Although there is support for the contrary, teachers, especially when there is no requirement for specialized training in teaching the deaf, should not be expected to perform the functions of highly specialized personnel such as audiologists, speech therapists and language specialists and still be expected to fully cover the subject matter of a regular curriculum. It is the opinion of the author that this expectation in many programs is one of the primary reasons why education of deaf students has generally progressed much slower than hearing students--social studies teachers for example have spent a considerable amount of their time teaching listening skills, language and speech to individual students rather than social studies to the class. On the other hand, teachers should not function independently of such support personnel since they are accountable

for the total development of the child.

Observations: There appears to be inadequate interaction between the support staff and the teachers at the school which indicates they are not taking a team approach. Teachers in all subjects should have regular contact with the speech therapist and language teachers to ensure the integration of language and speech arts throughout the curriculum. In spite of the availability of a hearing aid technician and a provincial government financial support program for hearing aids for needy students, two of the students interviewed had had a non-functioning aid for some time and one had no aid at all 'because my family couldn't afford it'. In addition, quite a few of the students interviewed claimed they were not scheduled for any speech therapy at all during the fall term. One of the major concerns of the teaching staff was the lack of time to do things properly, resulting largely in a 'crisis management' approach to tasks at hand especially since the introduction of the new curriculum and reporting procedures last fall. While the students do not appear to have been directly affected by this, a large number of those interviewed appeared to be current or impending victims of job burnout and future students are bound to pay for this unless something is done about it during the next year or two.

Recommendations:

* The school should be commended for having a full complement of support service positions from audiologist to occupational therapist and for having the school guidance counsellor instruct in the classroom.
* Frequent on-going interaction between academic subject teachers and the support staff is needed to assure that progress in language and speech is enhanced by all those involved in the student's education. Problem areas in language and speech should be identified and reported to the appropriate support personnel in some formal manner.
* A team approach can be very effective if properly implemented but requires more time and effort by all those involved. This factor, in addition to the extra time involved in developing the IEP must be recognized and the time allocated to classroom duties must be adjusted if a high quality job is to be expected.

Curriculum

Comments: Curriculum specialists are much better able to evaluate this area

than the author. Wherever possible, the same course of study which hearing students take should be available to deaf students. Language deficiencies can be overcome by adapting the instructional materials and instructional approaches. A far greater problem lies in the fact that deaf students generally lack the background knowledge which teachers of hearing students can assume they have learned outside of the classroom through everyday life situations, situations which deaf students may not have been exposed to. As an example of this, hearing children frequently overhear their parents discuss (or even argue over) financial matters while a deaf child--even in a home where the parents use a total communication approach--will not be exposed to it if the discussion takes place, as it usually does, in another room. Educating deaf students thus provides a far greater challenge than educating hearing students. It goes without saying that a well planned curriculum is essential to an effective program--'if you don't know where you are going, how will you know when you have arrived'.

Observations: Generally, the staff appears to have done an excellent job (considering among other things, the time frame available for this work) in adapting the Alberta curriculum to the needs of deaf students of similar academic ability, allowing for both language deficiencies and the much more limited out-of-classroom experiences of life that deafness imposes on the children. Major changes to the curriculum and the development of appropriate instructional materials requires considerable time if it is to be done properly and the staff have been hard pressed for time. There also appears inadequate or non-existant communication between the teams selected to develop certain areas of the curriculum and those who are expected to implement it. This is important to provide an integrated approach and to avoid unwanted overlapping or outright duplication of subject matter. A substantial number of students interviewed complained about a lack of challenging subject matter, claiming that there was considerable duplication of subject matter from previous years. A considerable number of teachers also expressed concern that they were not aware of what the children had previously learned but expressed optimism that this situation would change as the curriculum was further developed and implemented. The staff, while concerned about the amount of extra work involved in making major changes to the curriculum and having to get specific lesson plans on paper along with IEPs, gave strong support to this

effort. A substantial number of them, however, also expressed concern that there was little communication between the various developmental areas and even between them and the persons assigned responsibility for the specific subject area they taught in and especially between them and the language specialist coordinator. Although there is a course in chemistry for the senior level students in the academic track, there is no full course in elementary algebra. It would seem that a course in algebra would be of great benefit to those students who wished to go on and pursue further education at either the college or technical school level.

Recommendations:

* The school, as it continues to revise and implement the new curriculum, should consider giving at least the key personnel in each major area a short term summer contract to allow them to develop this and related instructional materials prior to the start of the school year.
* The curriculum should be integrated so that learning in one area will reinforce learning in another but there will be a minimum of unintentional overlapping and the program will be designed to build on previous learning experiences. To do so requires careful overview and review by an interdisciplinary team with adequate time resources allocated for this function.
* Considerably more effort should be taken to articulate the programs among grades.
* A full year course in elementary algebra should be considered.

III. Staff Qualifications, Attitudes and Perceptions

Qualifications and Professional Development

Comments: A properly trained staff with the proper attitude is essential to the success of any program for deaf students. Training and professional development may be formal or informal and may be obtained in a variety of ways--by taking post graduate studies, by attending appropriate external workshops and short-term courses, by playing an active role in in-house workshops and professional day activities, by informal exchange of experiences, strategies, etc. with fellow teachers and through guided advice and assistance of master teachers (and in the case of deaf teachers, by reviewing the techniques and learning strategies that they and their fellow students best learned by). The trend today in North America is

increasingly to require a Masters degree in either special education or deaf education.

Observations: According to the report on ASD Teacher Statistics, only 3 of the full-time permanent academic teachers did not have formal training as teachers of the deaf although the provincial government has no such requirement and only 3 of those with partial training are not pursuing further training. Formal training was taken by those trained at eleven different training programs (ten of which were out of province), reflecting a wide variety of approaches and philosophies to teaching deaf students. The school has a liberal leave policy and financial support for those wishing to upgrade their training and the staff appears to make good use of this opportunity with 3 of the teaching staff taking a full years leave this way. The school also has many professional days at which a wide variety of topics are covered, many of them directly related to teaching deaf students although there was considerable concern among those interviewed that they were not properly planned by the administration and there was little follow up on the topics covered. Although, as noted above, there were separate get-togethers for the prevocational and academic staff during coffee breaks, there was lively discussion among the respective groups and lunch time also provided an excellent time for professional interaction among the staff, albeit of limited duration. The library has a large collection of materials (including all major current periodicals) on education of the deaf but relatively little use of it is made by the teaching staff (although there is considerable use by University of Alberta students). The teaching staff are members of the provincial civil service union rather than the Alberta Teachers Association and the former is more concerned with working conditions and compensation than professional issues. The teachers have no school-wide, city-wide, or province-wide association with which to formally deal with professional issues and educational concerns and thus they also have no official spokesperson to deal with the administration on professional issues and it is difficult for the administration to be sure that concerns expressed to them by individual teachers reflect concerns of the group.

Recommendations:

* The school should be commended for the substantial number of teachers

with formal education in teaching the deaf, especially at the Masters level in spite of no such requirement by provincial regulations.

* The province should review the requirements for teaching the deaf to determine whether changing circumstances and the trend to requiring a Masters degree warrants changes in its policy.

* The staff should recognize the wide variety of programs they have received their training in and the wide variety and richness of experience many of them bring to the school and establish some formal means of sharing this with others on the staff.

* A teachers association (school-wide, Edmonton area-wide, province-wide or even a strong, active provincial unit of the Association of Canadian Educators of the Hearing Impaired) should be established to not only give the teachers a formal focal point for dealing with professional issues and concerns with the administration but also to take responsibility for developing professional day activities, workshops and other professional development activities.

* The teachers and provincial government should consider the advantages of having the ATA rather than the civil service union represent their interests and change regulations to make this possible if it is deemed more advantageous to both.

Attitude and Perception of Role

Comments: Due to the specialized nature of their own teaching role, the importance of the support team involvement and a need to work closely with parents in supporting the non-classroom development of the deaf child, teachers at ASD need to be team players. Teaching deaf students requires considerably more patience and energy than teaching students in a regular classroom situation. In general, teachers of deaf students in the past have come fresh into the classroom with unrealistically high expectations of the students and as years pass lower these expectations out of frustration and build up defense mechanisms to justify these lower expectations and a chain of self-fulfilling prophesies. A quality program will have a teaching staff which maintains high expectations of the students but which recognizes that the time frame for specific achievement levels may not be the same as for hearing students and that the means of determining achievement levels also may not be the same as for hearing students.

Observations: In general, the teaching staff demonstrated a very

positive attitude towards the children they were teaching and appeared to genuinely enjoy working with them. The students interviewed commented very favourably on the teaching staff with a few individual exceptions to be expected. The teachers also acknowledged the need to work closely together and supported the team concept in principle but acknowledged there was a wide gap in practice, invariably due to a perceived lack of time and pressure to give other matters priority on their limited time and energy resources. The teachers also felt that parental involvement was important and, in general, enjoyed contact with the parents. They expressed concern that what they felt was a small but very vocal minority of parents was exercising undue influence on their jobs and that the administration was not 'protecting' them from this influence. Teachers were also concerned that the parents were being encouraged (probably unintentionally) to deal with the administration and even to take their complaints to personnel in the provincial government over situations which should be resolved by direct action between the parents and the teachers. As reported earlier, there appears to be considerable burnout in various stages among the staff and a widespread perception is that the administration does not sufficiently treat them as professionals. This, along with the pressures from the new curriculum, the IEP, and reporting changes has resulted in a serious morale problem. One immediate effect of this problem is that some extra curricular activities have had to be curtailed as the staff have declined to sponsor them. With the current Superintendent leaving, an excellent opportunity exists to appoint someone the staff will give greater trust to and to eliminate many of the perceived problems between the staff and the administration. The staff welcomed opportunities for both external and internal appraisals. They were concerned, however over the timing of the current evaluation which gave the appearance to them of being essentially a reaction to political pressure coming on the heels of many other changes noted previously. They recognize that no program is immune from creeping lower expectations and a regular periodic evaluation of the school is a healthy step towards minimizing this.

Recommendations"

* The teaching staff and academic support staff should be commended

for their positive attitude towards the students, their willingness to work as a team when conditions permit and their attitude towards parental involvement.

* In view of the currently low morale, partly due to a perceived feeling that the administration is not sufficiently looking after their interests and is not treating them as professionals, the government should do all it can to include their viewpoint when considering the appointment of a replacement for the Superintendent. This, combined with a more orderly phasing in of curriculum changes and development of IEPs should go a long way towards improving morale and drawing upon the many strengths of the staff. The problems with the administration may be more imagined than real or unduly exaggerated but nevertheless this is an area that needs immediate attention.

* Parents should be entitled to play an important role in the education of their children but the administration and the Department of Education should make sure that the role they play does not intrude on areas which professional expertise is obviously called for.

* The Department of Education should establish a schedule for periodical reevaluations of the school at five or so year intervals as a normal procedure to diminish the tension and apprehension which an unscheduled evaluation such as the current one may create. Future evaluations should include a listing of areas identified in previous evaluations as being in need of change or improvement so that the progress towards eliminating these problems and the strengthening of other identified areas can be assessed.

IV. Administration

Policy Development

Comments: A good school program will include a strong administration able to obtain, maintain and coordinate the use of the various physical and human resources needed and able to establish an appropriate framework or set of policies to ensure the effective and efficient use of these resources. In the absence of a formal policy making body such as a school board, the administration should make sure that they are sensitized to the perceptions of the various players involved--the staff, the students, the

parents and the community in which their graduates will live.

Observations: The administration appears to be effective in obtaining and maintaining the necessary physical resources and in obtaining the necessary human resources. Managing the ASD and attempting to please the government, parents, students and the deaf community as well as the staff is an enormous undertaking and requires a difficult balancing act. The administration in attempting to please all these players appears to have promised more than it can deliver and appears to have been lately trying to satisfy the government and parents at the expense of good relations with the staff. Interviews with members of the administrative team left the feeling that they were genuinely interested in the interests of the staff however and it appears more a matter of allocating more of their time and energy to listening to the staff than an attitudal problem. Many of the teachers interviewed felt that many decisions which involved professional judgments for which they felt they were qualified to contribute to were unilaterally decided upon and imposed on them. Every staff member interviewed identified the administration as the current major weakness of the school which should be strengthened and that more time should be spent in listening to the staff, in planning and in articulating policy. The real problem appears to be that the administration, in attempting to please all the players, was attempting to do too much, too soon rather than doing the wrong things.

Recommendations:

* In spite of the serious problem of staff morale and the apparent lack of adequate near-term planning, the administration should be commended for managing what is, overall, an excellent program and for looking into the long term future of the school as documented in "The Next 25".

* The new administration team should give top priority to rebuilding high morale among the teaching staff, rebuilding an environment of mutual trust and respect, which appears to have been lost over the past few years, by involving them more directly in the decision making process.

Supervision of Staff

Comments: In a professional school setting, supervision implies guidance,

encouragement and inspiration rather than the regular directing and monitoring of daily tasks. Thus it is possible to have a greater supervisor span of control and the amount of time spent in actual supervision is relatively small. There are, however, even here reasonable limits.

Observations: Although the Teacher Seniors are listed as part of the administrative team, their function has been changed to more of a staff function than a line function and responsibility for evaluating the teachers has been shifted to the Principal and the reason for this shift has never been clearly articulated to the staff involved. This has generated a very strong negative reaction because the Principal (apparently already overburdened with other concerns) rarely directly observes the teachers or discusses their work with them and in fact, one of the Teacher Seniors has apparently not been formally evaluated at all for the past two or three years due to a claimed lack of time. The teachers feel it is impossible for the Principal to properly evaluate them and feel strongly that the persons who work with them on a regular basis and know their strengths and weaknesses and are able to help them directly in their growth should be responsible for this. The Teacher Seniors, however, already have a full teaching load and are assuming responsibility for coordinating specific general areas of curriculum development and they, too, do not appear to have adequate time to assist as Master Teachers at the present time.

Recommendations:

* The Teacher Seniors should be given back the responsibility of doing the teacher evaluations of those in their department. To accomplish this and also serve as Master Teachers, assisting new teachers in their growth, the administration should consider giving them adequate time from direct teaching duties to accomplish this.

CONCLUSIONS

No attempt has been made to evaluate specific standards, such as reading and writing levels, levels of understandable speech etc. since no records were available to our Education for the Deaf Specialists team. There exist no agreed upon specific standards among educators of the deaf in any case. The author of this report understands the concern of parents of the children regarding the more limited ability of their deaf children to use

and speak English as compared with hearing children they may have at the same age level. He agrees that these are two very important aspects of a deaf child's education which any good program will give an integrated approach to developing. He feels that the proper way to determine whether a school is doing the job we should expect of it is to look at the whole child and wonderful statements such as those articulated in the "Goals of Basic Education for Alberta". Evaluated from this perspective, the school has earned excellent marks. There are serious morale problems, planning appears inadequate, and the school appears to be attempting too much, too soon but in spite of these general problems, the school has an excellent program, a well trained staff willing to change, to cooperate, to share, to experiment and to grow. The school has one of the highest percentages of those going on to higher education of all schools for the deaf in Canada. The students appear confident with a healthy self-esteem, ready to take on more challenge if given the opportunity.

Albertans have reason to be proud of the ASD.

December 23, 1982.